DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 222 214 JC 820 474

TITLE Handbook of Accreditation and Policy Manual. 1981 Edition.
INSTITUTION Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Aptos, CA. Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges.
PUB DATE 81
NOTE 144p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Accreditation (Institutions); *Accrediting Agencies; *Agency Role; Community Colleges; Eligibility; *Evaluation Methods; Institutional Evaluation; Policy; Program Evaluation; *Standards; *Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

Designed by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), this handbook outlines the standards, procedures, and policies for the accreditation of community and junior colleges in California, Hawaii, Micronesia, Guam, and American Samoa. Part 1 states the conditions for achieving and maintaining accreditation, focusing on eligibility, accreditation candidacy, accredited status, application procedures, periodic review, and appeal. Part 2 discusses the use of standards for accreditation in self-study, accreditation team visits, and review by ACCJC. The standards themselves are also presented, covering institutional goals and objectives; educational programs; instructional staff; student and community services; learning, physical, and financial resources; governance and administration; and district/system relationships. Part 3 examines the institutional self-study, describing the format and content of four types of accreditation reports and the documentation required for accreditation visits. Part 4 outlines procedures for evaluation teams, visits, and reports, and part 5 reviews the procedures used by the ACCJC for accreditation actions. Part 6 details commission policies related to, for example, the purposes of accreditation, public access, the role of officers, practices and ethics, review and appeal, and information disclosure. Appendices include a list of accrediting agencies, a glossary, and suggestions for institutional self-study. (HB)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED222214

# HANDBOOK OF ACCREDITATION AND POLICY MANUAL

# 1981 EDITION

## ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. E. Swenson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

VC 820 474

**9053 Soquel Drive**
**P.O. Box 70**
**Aptos, California 95003**
**(408) 688-7575**

**Robert E. Swenson**
**Executive Director**

**Sue Lundquist**
**Administrative Secretary**

# ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

1982-83

APPOINTING ORGANIZATION and COMMISSIONER

California Community and Junior College Association

Margaret Buckley, Chairperson, Health Careers Department, Bakersfield College
1801 Panorama Drive, Bakersfield, CA 93305

**Thomas W. Fryer, Jr., Chancellor, Foothill-De Anza Community College District,
12345 El Monte Road, Los Altos Hills, CA 94022

Jo Ann Lee, Instructor, Business, Pasadena City College,
1570 East Colorado Boulevard, Pasadena, CA 91106

John T. McCuen, Superintendent-President, Long Beach City College,
4901 East Carson Street, Long Beach, CA 90808

*John C. Petersen, Superintendent-President, Cabrillo College
6500 Soquel Drive, Aptos, CA 95003

Gary S. Resnick, Professor, Natural Science, Saddleback College,
28000 Marguerite Parkway, Mission Viejo, CA 92692

University of Hawaii

Dewey Kim, Chancellor for Community Colleges, University of Hawaii
2444 Dole Street, Honolulu, HI 96822

Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges

Gus Guichard, Executive Vice Chancellor, California Community Colleges,
1238 S Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities

Margaret P. Bates, Route 3, Box 575, Carmel, CA 93923

Accrediting Commission for Schools

Maxine Frost, Board of Education, Riverside Unified School District,
6716 Belinda Drive, Riverside, CA 92504

Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges

Fred L. Esvelt, President, Columbia Basin College,
Tri Cities, Washington 99301

Western Association of Schools and Colleges Board of Directors

Lois Carson, Governing Board, San Bernardino Community College District,
745 North Dallas Avenue, San Bernardino, CA 92410

One member to be appointed.

James E. Deitz, President, Heald Colleges,
1255 Post Street, San Francisco, CA 94109

Carol Enos, Governing Board, Rancho Santiago Community College District,
2615 Chestnut Street, Orange, CA 92667

*Chairman
**Vice-Chairman

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| INTRODUCTION | i |
| PART I - ACHIEVING AND MAINTAINING ACCREDITATION | 1 |
| Conditions for Eligibility | 1 |
| Application for Review of Eligibility | 2 |
| Candidate for Accreditation | 2 |
| Procedures Required of Candidate Institutions | 3 |
| Accredited Status | 3 |
| Reapplication | 4 |
| Periodic Review | 4 |
| Interim Reports and Visits | 5 |
| Review and Appeal | 5 |
| PART II - STANDARDS FOR ACCREDITATION | 6 |
| Description and Application | 6 |
| Use of the Standards in the Self-Study | 6 |
| Use of the Standards by the Team in the Evaluation Visit | 6 |
| Use of the Standards by the Commission in its Review | 7 |
| Mandatory Requirements | 7 |
| Standard One: Goals and Objectives | 8 |
| Standard Two: Educational Programs | 10 |
| Standard Three: Institutional Staff | 16 |
| Standard Four: Student Services | 20 |
| Standard Five: Community Services | 23 |
| Standard Six: Learning Resources | 26 |
| Standard Seven: Physical Resources | 29 |
| Standard Eight: Financial Resources | 31 |
| Standard Nine: Governance and Administration | 33 |
| Standard Ten: District or System Relationships | 37 |
| PART III - INSTITUTIONAL SELF-STUDY | 39 |
| The Comprehensive Report - Format and Content | 39 |
| The Fifth-Year or Candidacy Renewal Report - Format and Content | 41 |
| The Special Project Report - Format and Content | 42 |
| The Interim or Substantive Change Report - Format and Content | 43 |
| Documentation for Comprehensive Accreditation Visits (Candidacy, Accreditation, Reaffirmation of Accreditation | 44 |
| PART IV - EVALUATION TEAMS, VISITS, AND REPORTS | 49 |
| Scheduling Evaluation Visits | 49 |
| Selection of Visiting Teams | 50 |
| Institutional Responsibilities | 51 |
| Team Chairman Responsibilities | 52 |

Page

Instructions for Team Members. . . . . 54

The Comprehensive Evaluation Team Visit and Report . . . . . 56
The Fifth-Year Validation Visit and Report . . . . . 61
The Interim Visit and Report . . . . . 63
The Substantive Change Visit and Report. . . . . 64

PART V - COMMISSION PROCEDURES FOR ACCREDITATION ACTIONS. . . . . 65

Procedures with Team Reports . . . . . 65
Team Recommendations . . . . . 65
Notification of Accreditation Actions. . . . . 65
Review of Decisions. . . . . 65
Appeal of Decisions. . . . . 66

PART VI - COMMISSION POLICIES . . . . . 67

Purposes of Institutional Accreditation. . . . . 68
Coordination Among WASC Commissions. . . . . 69
Relationship Between General and Specialized Agencies. . . . 70
Public Access Policy . . . . . 71
Code of Commission Good Practice and Ethical Conduct . . . . 72
Commission Procedures in Matters of Institutional Ethics and Integrity . . . . . 75
Accreditation of Institutions and Systems. . . . . 76
Institutional Accreditation Liaison Officer. . . . . 78
Institutional Integrity. . . . . 79
Special Institutional Reviews and Consideration of Complaints. . . . . 81
Substantive Change . . . . . 82
Commission Decisions on Institutions . . . . . 83
Negative Actions of the Commission . . . . . 84
Review of Commission Actions . . . . . 86
WASC Appeals Procedures. . . . . 90
Disclosure and Confidentiality of Information. . . . . 93
General Education Requirements in Specialized Programs . . . 94
Accreditation and Nontraditional Study . . . . . 95
Transfers from Unaccredited Institutions . . . . . 97
Credit for Prior Experiential Learning in Undergraduate Programs. . . . . 98
Nondiscrimination. . . . . 100
Accreditation and Collective Bargaining. . . . . 101
Postsecondary Educational Programs Conducted by Accredited or Candidate Institutions on Military Bases . . . . . 102
Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations . . . . . 108
Accreditation of United States Institutions Outside of the United States . . . . . 112

PART VII - APPENDIX

A. Accreditation Agencies and Related Organizations . . . . 113
Map of Regional Associations of the United States . 117

Page

B. Glossary of Definitions and Acronyms . . . . . 118

C. Suggestions for Organizing a Self-Study. . . . . 121

D. Roles of Senates and Bargaining Units. . . . . 122

E. Forms - Certification of the Institutional Self-Study Report. . . . . 123
Confidential Recommendation Form . . . . . 124

F. Fee Schedule 1981-82 . . . . . 126

PART VIII - INDEX . . . . . 127

# INTRODUCTION

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges provides accreditation services for one and two-year postsecondary educational institutions in California, Hawaii, Micronesia, Guam, and American Samoa. ACCJC evaluates institutions; specialized program accreditation is furnished through other agencies. (See Appendix for more detailed information on accreditation organizations.)

Accreditation is a voluntary, non-governmental process. Its policies and procedures have been developed by the accredited institutions, and are reviewed periodically by their accreditation liaison officers. Proposed changes are considered by the governing body, ACCJC, which is made up of institutional and public members. The Commission membership is published in the annual directory of accredited institutions.

Recommendations for changes in policies and procedures should be submitted to the ACCJC Executive Director or any member of the Commission. Proposed changes are reviewed with member institutions before action by the Commission. The Handbook uses a loose-leaf format so that changes may be easily incorporated to keep the information current.

This Handbook has been approved by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges for use by institutions seeking candidacy, initial accreditation, or reaffirmation of accreditation, and by ACCJC teams that visit institutions for evaluation purposes. Others may find it helpful in understanding the purposes and uses of accreditation.

The 1981 edition places new emphasis on standards for accreditation. It represents the product of two years of study by the Commission, by committees made up of experienced accreditors, and finally by representatives of all of the institutions affiliated with ACCJC.

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges is recognized by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, a non-governmental agency which assists the users of accreditation in identifying responsible and reputable accrediting bodies.

ACCJC is also listed by the U.S. Secretary of Education as a nationally-recognized agency determined to be a reliable authority on the quality of education offered by colleges in its region.

## PART I - ACHIEVING AND MAINTAINING ACCREDITATION

### Conditions for Eligibility

Prior to making a formal application, an institution wishing to become a Candidate for Accreditation should determine whether it meets the conditions of eligibility listed below:

1. Have a charter and/or formal authority from the appropriate governmental agency to award a certificate, diploma, or degree. Where the appropriate governmental agency has only very minimum standards or requirements, but at the same time has a secondary or higher level of approval, the Commission will expect institutions to have met the higher standards and secured the secondary level of approval.

2. Have a governing board which includes representatives reflecting the public interest.

3. Have employed a chief administrative officer.

4. Publish educational objectives appropriate to postsecondary education in level, quality, and standards, and provide a clear statement of its means for achieving those objectives.

5. Offer one or more educational programs, of at least one academic year in length or the equivalent, at the postsecondary level.

6. Require for its degree programs that at least 25% of the units or courses be in general education at the postsecondary level. The general education component should include demonstrated competence in writing and computational skills, and an introduction to some of the major areas of knowledge.

7. Have learning resources including a faculty and library adequate for the educational programs offered or, in lieu of a library, have made specific long-term arrangements for student access to such resources.

8. Have developed a preliminary survey or evidence of basic planning for the development of the institution.

9. Have admission policies compatible with its stated objectives.

10. Have established an adequate financial base of funding commitments and submit a copy of its current budget and a copy of its current audited financial statement prepared by an independent certified public accountant. The audit must be certified and any qualifications explained. It is recommended that the auditor employ as a guide, Audits of Colleges and Universities, published by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants.

11. Have published policies and procedures, in keeping with generally accepted practices, for refunding fees and charges to students

who withdraw from enrollment, and for dealing with student grievances.

12. Have a catalog and other appropriate official publications available to students and public, setting forth purposes and objectives; entrance requirements and procedures; rules and regulations; programs and courses; degree completion requirements; costs; and other items relative to attending the institution or withdrawing from it.

## Application for Review of Eligibility

If an institution believes it meets the twelve conditions, it submits to the Commission office:

1. Two copies of a "Report on Eligibility" in which factual information on each of the twelve conditions is provided. Supporting documents should include planning studies, current catalog, proposed or current budget, latest audited financial statement complying with condition 10, charter or articles of incorporation, bylaws of the governing board, identifying information on board members, a roster of faculty and administrative staff (if not included in the catalog), and proof of state authority to grant certificates or degrees.

2. A review fee of $100 (non-refundable).

Upon receipt of the above, the Commission staff will arrange an office conference or visit to the institution to discuss the Report and to encourage the institution to proceed or to consider other alternatives.

If the institution decides to proceed, the Commission will review the Report on Eligibility and notify the institution whether it meets the eligibility requirements to apply for candidacy status.

## Candidate for Accreditation

Candidate for Accreditation status offers institutions the opportunity to establish a publicly recognized relationship with a regional accrediting commission. It is a preliminary affiliation, initially awarded for two years. Candidacy is not accreditation and does not assure eventual accreditation. It indicates that an institution is progressing toward accreditation.

If an institution meets the conditions of eligibility and wishes to be considered for candidacy, it should:

1. Submit an application for candidacy signed by the chief executive officer on a form furnished by the Commission office.

2. Confer with the Commission staff regarding an evaluation time schedule, including a comprehensive self-study and team visit.

3. Prepare a self-study in accordance with the instructions in the Handbook.

4. Pay the evaluation service charge for a candidacy visit (see Appendix for fee schedule).

The Commission will review the institutional self-study, the evaluation team report, and other appropriate documents, and will notify the institution if it is accepted as a Candidate for Accreditation.

Institutions granted candidacy must use the following statement if they wish to describe that status publicly:

> Candidate for Accreditation is a status of preliminary affiliation with the Commission, initially awarded for two years, following a specified procedure for institutional self-study and on-site visitation. Candidacy is subject to renewal. Candidacy is not accreditation and does not assure eventual accreditation. It is an indication that the institution is progressing toward accreditation.

Policies governing candidacy are found in the policy section of this Handbook.

## Procedures Required of Candidate Institutions

Institutions admitted to the status of Candidate for Accreditation are required to:

1. File an annual report and audited financial statement in accordance with guidelines supplied by the Commission.

2. Keep the Commission staff informed of any significant changes or developments.

3. Every two years prepare a comprehensive self-study in accordance with the Handbook, and have an on-site visit by an evaluation team appointed by the Commission. The major task of these evaluators is to ascertain that the institution is making reasonable progress toward accreditation in the light of the plans it submitted in its application documents and in subsequent reports. Their visit constitutes the Commission's review of an institution's candidate status, and their evaluation report is acted on by the full Commission.

## Accredited Status

After at least one full year in candidacy status has elapsed, a candidate institution may apply for accreditation following consultation with the Commission staff. The process includes:

1. A request from the chief executive officer on a form furnished by the Commission office.

2. A self-study prepared in accordance with the Handbook instructions.

3. An evaluation visit arranged by ACCJC (see Appendix for the schedule of charges).

4. A review of the evaluation reports and other appropriate materials by the Commission.

If the institution is granted accreditation, the following shall appear in all appropriate publications:

> "(Name of Institution) is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges."

## Reapplication

Institutions which are not granted candidacy or accreditation may reapply only after they have corrected the deficiencies noted in the Commission review. If an institution does not achieve accreditation within a six-year period, it will be dropped from the list of candidates, and must wait two years before reapplying. If, in the judgment of the Commission, special conditions exist which warrant additional time, the Commission may extend candidacy.

## Periodic Review

The normal intervals for comprehensive evaluations are five years following initial accreditation, and ten years thereafter. In the fifth year of the ten-year cycle, the institution has the following options:

1. A comprehensive self-study and evaluation visit.

2. A limited self-study and validation visit.

3. An alternative special study project.

4. Continuing institutional research evaluation.

Options 3 and 4 require advance approval by the Commission. The procedures for the first three alternatives are described in the self-study section.

Under option 3, an institution may choose to concentrate on one or more major institutional problems which involve evaluation and planning.

For option 4, a regular program of institutional research may be accepted if it documents an on-going system of institutional evaluation and planning.

## Interim Reports and Visits

The Commission may schedule interim reports and/or visits when the regular evaluation process reveals substantive problems which should be addressed promptly.

## Review and Appeal

Institutions whose applications for candidacy, renewal of candidacy, accreditation, or reaffirmation of accreditation are denied or whose candidacy or accreditation is terminated by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges may request a review of the Commission's decision. Such a review must be requested prior to a filing of an appeal by the institution to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. The policies and procedures which govern the conduct of the Commission's review are found in the policy section.

An institution which, after availing itself of the review procedure of the Commission, still believes itself aggrieved by the Commission's denial or withdrawal of candidacy or accreditation, may appeal such action within thirty days of receipt of notice, thereof, to the President of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. The WASC President shall arrange a hearing for representatives of the institution before the Association's Hearing Board, established for this purpose, as prescribed in Article VI of the Constitution of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges and published in the annual Directory of WASC.

## PART II - STANDARDS FOR ACCREDITATION

### Description and Application

ACCJC standards represent an approved model of good practice for those institutions which fall within its jurisdiction. They provide a basis for the institutions, the evaluation teams, and the Commission to make judgments on the quality of educational programs and services, and the integrity of institutional practices.

The standards are designed to accommodate the diverse group of post-secondary institutions served by ACCJC, without compromising the Commission's commitment to evaluating institutional quality and integrity. Unique institutions may find it difficult at times to fulfill some of the standards, which often appear to reflect traditional practice. In such cases demonstrated equivalency of quality or accomplishment of the objective of the standard is the responsibility of the institution.

Public community colleges are the predominant membership group in ACCJC. The standards have been written to describe good practice in these institutions, most of which offer comprehensive programs and services.

Special purpose institutions and community colleges with limited purposes will find certain standards inapplicable, and should explain why in their self-study reports.

The sub-heads, or components of the standards, are not in themselves absolute mandates for candidacy or accreditation. Visiting teams and the Commission examine an institution in its totality, and non-compliance or poor compliance with some components of the standards does not of itself preclude Commission approval. It should further be noted that institutional accreditation as practiced by the regional commissions does not accredit specific courses or programs as such, and some aspects of an institution will always be stronger than others. However, extreme weakness of some program or programs may threaten an institution's candidate or accredited status.

### Use of the Standards in the Self-Study

The heart of accreditation lies in periodic self-appraisal by each member institution. Between scheduled visits, the institutions in their annual reports describe significant changes and efforts toward improvement. In preparation for each accreditation review, institutions prepare extensive self-evaluations using the ACCJC standards as criteria.

### Use of the Standards by the Team in the Evaluation Visit

After completion of the institutional study, professional colleagues from similar-type institutions join in the voluntary accreditation process by conducting an evaluation visit. The team follows carefully-

designed Commission procedures and uses the Commission standards as a model of good practice in developing its evaluation report. In keeping with accreditation emphasis on institutional improvement, the majority of team recommendations fall in the category of recommended (but not mandated) changes and improvements. Occasionally an institution may properly take issue with a team recommendation and respond with its own rationale for existing practice.

## Use of the Standards by the Commission in its Review

The Commission uses the standards to achieve consistency and objectivity in making judgments about the accredited status of institutional members and applicants. The Commission also recognizes the need for continuing reassessment of the accreditation standards, and uses member advice to keep the standards up-to-date.

## Mandatory Requirements

In addition to an evaluation procedure using Commission standards, all institutions must:

1. Fulfill the "Conditions of Eligibility," pp. 1-2.

2. Comply with Commission directives issued in accordance with the "Code of Commission Good Practice and Ethical Conduct," pp. 72-74.

3. Demonstrate integrity in relations with students, the institution's constituencies, the Commission, and the public. See "Commission Procedures in Matters of Institutional Ethics and Integrity," p. 75.

4. Pay the fees and service charges assessed to finance Commission operations.

STANDARD ONE: GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Most one and two-year postsecondary institutions are committed to one or more of these goals: general, transfer, occupational, or continuing education; education in the basic skills; provision of student services; and special community services appropriate to the area served.

Standard 1A

The institution is guided by clearly stated general goals and specific objectives which are consistent with the historical and legal mission of the public community college, or in the case of the independent institutions, are appropriate to the usual functions of postsecondary education. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

1A.1 Specific objectives to implement the institution's long-range goals.

1A.2 Objectives which:

a) Have sufficient clarity and precision to be assessable.
b) Are substantiated by supporting data.
c) Are understood and accepted by the college community.
d) Are included in appropriate institutional publications.

Standard 1B

The statement of goals and objectives defines the degree of comprehensiveness of the institution and its distinctive nature. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

1B.1 Continuing study of the educational needs of the clientele served by the institution.

1B.2 A descriptive title for the institution appropriate to its objectives and legal status.

1B.3 An accurate portrayal of institutional functions in its published material.

1B.4 Planning and resource allocation which relate to the goals and objectives.

1B.5 Programs and services appropriate to the institution's service area, size, facilities, financing, age, instructional methods and procedures, and nature of support.

Standard 1C

The goals and objectives are re-examined periodically with participation by all segments of the institution. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

1C.1 Review by students, staff, and trustees at least once since the last accreditation report.

1C.2 Evidence that goals and objectives guide planning and decision-making.

1C.3 A plan for assessing the achievement of each objective, and the availability of such evaluation studies to all segments of the institution.

## ILLUSTRATIVE EVALUATION TOPICS AND ACTIVITIES

Each standard, if applicable to the institution, implies appropriate evaluation. The list below is intended to be suggestive rather than exhaustive.

1. The relevance of the institution's goals and objectives to its social, economic, and political environment.

2. The extent of participation in the formulation of institutional goals and objectives.

3. The degree to which there is staff and governing board awareness of and commitment to the institution's goals and objectives.

4. The degree to which institutional planning and resource allocation relate to objectives.

5. The degree to which institutional objectives are being met, using such methods as student satisfaction surveys, employment surveys, competency measures, achievement records of transfer students, etc.

STANDARD TWO: EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

The institutional objectives will determine the extent to which these standards are applicable. Institutions are asked to indicate the applicability of each standard in the self-evaluation reports.

Standard 2A

The educational program is clearly related to the objectives of the institution. This relationship between objectives and program is demonstrated in the policies of admission, content of curricula, requirements for graduation, and institutional methods and procedures. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

2A.1 Degree and certificate programs characterized by continuity, sequential progression, and synthesis of learning. Logical and appropriate curricula and course prerequisites which are adhered to in practice.

2A.2 Degree programs which provide opportunities for all students to be introduced to the major fields of knowledge (e.g., social and natural sciences, arts, humanities, etc.). Breadth of offering adequate to furnish students with opportunities to fulfill general education requirements. Demonstrated competence required in communication and computation skills.

2A.3 Programs and courses designed to develop specific intellectual and/or affective or creative capabilities and/or specific occupational or professional skills.

2A.4 Lower division programs to prepare students for transfer to baccalaureate degree institutions.

2A.5 Programs to prepare students for a specific field of employment, designed with advice from practitioners in the field. Advisory committees utilized in all vocational programs.

2A.6 Provision made for the curricular needs of special groups of students served by the institution.

2A.7 Published listings of "major" areas of concentration and of courses included in degree and certificate programs.

2A.8 All programs, whether traditional or nontraditional, developed, approved, and administered through defined institutional channels, and subjected to a system of periodic review and evaluation.

2A.9 Programs, wherever offered, which adhere to recognized educational standards.

2A.10 Access to and open consideration of differing points of view so that students are equipped to develop critical abilities.

Standard 2B

Educational evaluation and planning is systematic, involves representatives of all appropriate segments of the institution, and provides the basis for planning the use of human, financial, and physical resources. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

2B.1 A curriculum/course planning process which culminates in a written statement of an educational master plan that is regularly updated and which reflects the relationship between institutional programs and instructional purposes.

2B.2 Clearly specified institutional procedures and responsibility for the evaluation of program need and program quality.

2B.3 Vocational programs which are periodically reviewed and evaluated in light of changing technologies and job markets.

2B.4 Evidence of the success of students in meeting educational objectives; e.g., preparation for employment, transfer for further study, etc.

2B.5 Responsibility for curricular design and implementation vested in a designated body or bodies with clearly established channels of communication and control. A major role for faculty in the design, implementation, and coordination of programs.

2B.6 Human, financial, and physical resource allocations made in terms of educational program needs and plans.

Standard 2C

The principal institutional focus is a commitment to learning, including its evaluation and continuous improvement. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

2C.1 Faculty competent in assigned fields responsible for instruction.

2C.2 Continuous evaluation and supervision directed toward the improvement of instruction.

2C.3 Program development related to student learning capabilities and student objectives.

2C.4 Faculty involved in the development of library and other instructional resources, and in urging student use of such resources.

Standard 2D

Through catalogs, bulletins, handbooks, and other publications, students and the public are provided with clear, accurate, and helpful information about programs, course offerings, and alternatives available to assist them in attaining their personal educational goals and meeting institutional requirements. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

2D.1 Public documents, such as catalogs, bulletins, and handbooks which contain precise, accurate, and current statements of policies and procedures, including requirements for admission and graduation, grading policies, educational programs, and current course offerings, including their transferability.

2D.2 No statements that cannot be documented, especially regarding excellence of program or success in placement and achievement of graduates.

2D.3 A clear statement of the financial obligations and requirements of students, including accurate information regarding financial aids and tuition/fee refund policies.

Standard 2E

Evaluation of student learning or achievement and awarding of credit are based upon clearly stated and distinguishable criteria. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

2E.1 Published criteria for evaluating student performance/achievement.

2E.2 Evaluation of student performance which differentiates among levels of achievement.

2E.3 Credit awarded consonant with student learning or achievement and based upon generally accepted norms or equivalencies.

2E.4 Credit awarded for prior learning experience in accordance with Commission policy. (See ACCJC policy on "Credit for Prior Experiential Learning in Undergraduate Programs.")

Standard 2F

Off-campus educational programs and courses are integral parts of the institution. Their goals and objectives must be consonant with those of the institution. The institution maintains quality control of these programs and provides appropriate resources to maintain quality. Non-campus based institutions will demonstrate satisfactory quality control systems. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

2F.1 Goals and objectives of off-campus programs and courses consonant with those of the institution. If off-campus programs or courses

differ in purpose or procedure from those offered on-campus, the differences justified or their connection with the institution's mission clearly specified.

2F.2 Admission, retention, certificate, and degree requirements for off-campus programs and courses qualitatively consistent with those in effect on-campus. Comparable amounts of class time and student preparation for course credits.

2F.3 Off-campus programs and courses administered under established institutional policies and procedures, and supervised by an administrator who is part of the institutional organization.

2F.4 To assure quality in these programs and courses, on-campus administrators and faculty with appropriate involvement in planning, approval, and on-going evaluation of off-campus programs and courses, and in the selection of instructors.

2F.5 Qualifications of instructors in off-campus programs and courses commensurate with those for on-campus instructors.

2F.6 All conditions governing off-campus programs and courses fully disclosed in appropriate catalogs, brochures, announcements, and other promotional materials, including tuition/fee charges, refund policies, admission and academic requirements. Published materials with accurate, comprehensive descriptions of student services and learning resources. Exceptions to on-campus conditions indicated clearly. Publicity to prospective students factual and consistent with services actually provided.

2F.7 Credit for travel/study awarded for educational achievement and performance within program objectives, not for visits and tourist activities. Credit awarded for participation in travel/study courses based on the same standards required for on-campus courses.

2F.8 Work experience/cooperative education courses which are an integral part of program offerings and are adequately supervised and staffed.

Standard 2G

An accredited institution entering into any contractual relationship for credit programs or courses with persons or non-accredited organizations, ensures that educational and fiscal responsibility and control remain with and are exercised by the accredited institution. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

2G.1 Regular supervision and evaluation of the contract program by faculty and administrative personnel from the accredited institution.

2G.2 Degrees, certificates, and courses to be offered, and the amount of credit or the competence required for their successful completion,

determined in advance of the signing of the contract by the accredited institution. Contract processing in accordance with established institutional procedures and under the usual mechanism for faculty and administrative review. All degrees, certificates, or course credit awarded by the accredited institution.

2G.3 Curricular requirements and content established by the accredited institution in accordance with regular institutional procedures. Educational resources, such as library and instructional materials, of the same standards as those used for comparable non-contract educational programs.

2G.4 Student services, including permanent records and transcripts, a responsibility of the accredited institution. Student rights and grievance procedures governed by policies of the accredited institution.

Standard 2H

Non-credit courses and programs, whether offered on or off-campus, are integral to the educational mission of the institution and are characterized by an equivalent quality of planning, instruction, and evaluation to that in credit programs. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

2H.1 A core of full-time staff significantly involved in planning, operating, and evaluating all non-credit programs.

2H.2 Faculty with competence in the fields in which they teach.

2H.3 All conditions governing non-credit courses/programs fully disclosed in catalogs, brochures, announcements, and other promotional materials. (This information includes fees, refund policies, admission procedures, program standards, and requirements to complete the course or program.)

2H.4 Programs administered under appropriate institutional policies and procedures.

## ILLUSTRATIVE EVALUATION TOPICS AND ACTIVITIES

Each standard, if applicable to the institution, implies appropriate evaluation. The list below is intended to be suggestive rather than exhaustive.

1. The outcomes of the educational program, using student satisfaction surveys, follow-up studies of former students, employer evaluations and/or records of achievement of transfer students.

2. The extent, process and outcomes of educational program review.

Standard Two (Continued)

3. The curriculum development and revision process.

4. The degree to which innovative teaching practices are encouraged and supported.

5. The grading practices of the institution.

6. Studies relating to student retention rates and efforts to improve student retention.

7. The degree to which program and course descriptions listed in various publications are valid and accurate.

8. The program offerings in the light of community and/or student needs assessment.

9. Methods of quality control of personnel and educational practices for off-campus offerings, including any contractual relationships.

10. The method and extent of articulation with secondary schools and four year institutions.

11. The degree to which instructor evaluation is geared toward improvement of instruction.

## STANDARD THREE: INSTITUTIONAL STAFF

Staff includes all employed personnel. (Definitions for various types of staff are found in the glossary, Appendix B .) The categories of those who are employed by a postsecondary institution vary substantially from one institution to another, but typically include those who teach, those in student services, and those in learning resources and other related activities, para-professionals, support personnel, and those appointed to administrative and supervisory positions.

### Standard 3A

The staff is qualified by training and experience to achieve and promote the educational objectives of the institution. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

3A.1 Criteria for faculty selection, both full-time and part-time, clearly stated, public, and directly related to institutional and program objectives.

3A.2 Teaching effectiveness a principal criterion used in the selection and retention of teaching faculty.

3A.3 Criteria for the selection of administrators and the support staff which are clearly stated, public, and related to the duties and responsibilities of the assignment.

### Standard 3B

The faculty is committed to achieving and sustaining high levels of instruction, and may provide special campus and public services in the community served by the institution.

The faculty's primary professional commitment is to the institution's goals and objectives, which are achieved through effective teaching, scholarly activities, and, frequently, related public services. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

3B.1 Faculty who are available to students through the instructional program and academic advising.

3B.2 Faculty encouraged in scholarly or creative activities in their fields because of the importance of such activities to effective instruction.

### Standard 3C

The staff is sufficient in number and diversity of preparation to provide effective instruction and support services, while participating in educational planning and policy-making, curriculum development, and institutional governance.

The preparation and experience of the staff are significant factors in determining the quality of an institution and should be such as to further the objectives of the institution. The continuous professional growth of all members of the staff should be encouraged, and the institution should assist members of the staff to further their professional development. Effective instruction and support services are related to load. While assigning equitable and reasonable workloads for teaching faculty and other staff, an institution must also provide realistically for supervision of student activities and for participation in institutional governance, other institutional functions, and committee assignments. Periodic appraisal of workload assures that readjustments occur as institutional conditions change. Safeguards are provided against internal or external responsibilities which might jeopardize the quality or quantity of work that a faculty member is employed to perform. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

3C.1 Staff assignments which reflect the institutions' objectives and the proper use of the qualifications which each staff member possesses.

3C.2 Criteria for determining workloads which are clearly stated.

3C.3 Sufficient staff employed full-time at the institution to provide instruction, student services, educational planning and curriculum development, and to participate in institutional governance.

3C.4 Institutional provision of staff development opportunities. Staff participation and/or engagement in self-initiated programs.

3C.5 Policies regarding the obligations and responsibilities of full-time and part-time staff.

3C.6 Appropriate involvement of staff in the development and review of institutional policies.

Standard 3D

Institutional policy regarding the safeguarding of academic freedom and responsibility is clearly stated and readily available.

A sound educational climate requires a secure framework of academic freedom, which gives the scholar the right, and implies the obligation, to examine all data and to question every assumption. It obliges a teacher to present all information fairly and asserts the student's right to know the facts. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

3D.1 Within adopted and recorded institutional principles of academic freedom, faculty members are secure to teach and participate as responsible citizens in community activities. Any policies which may inhibit the exploration or promulgation of ideas contrary to institutional philosophy made clear to all staff in advance of employment and to students prior to admission.

3D.2 Faculty protection of the academic freedom of its members.

Standard 3E

Personnel policies and procedures affecting staff are clear, equitable and available for information and review.

Distinct policies and procedures should be developed for each staff group. Items which are common to all groups should also be part of available published materials. The institution should demonstrate the means by which it is responding to legislation pertaining to equal employment and educational opportunities, as well as to promotional standards and practices. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

3E.1 Procedures and criteria for personnel appointment, evaluation, retention, advancement, and due process explicitly stated. Staff involvement in these processes clearly defined.

3E.2 Salaries and benefits adequate to attract and retain qualified personnel.

3E.3 Personnel policies and procedures which are clearly stated, equitably administered, and available for information and review.

3E.4 A policy regarding privacy of information which is clearly stated and consistently administered.

## ILLUSTRATIVE EVALUATION TOPICS AND ACTIVITIES

Each standard, if applicable to the institution, implies appropriate evaluation. The list below is intended to be suggestive rather than exhaustive.

1. The extent to which staff qualifications, working conditions, career development and retraining opportunities, compensation practices, and general institutional climate enable staff to work harmoniously to achieve institutional objectives.

2. The compatibility of administrative, teaching, and support staff assignments with their training and experience qualifications.

3. The provision of staff development opportunities for each segment and the participation by staff.

4. The effectiveness of recruitment, selection, and evaluation procedures for each staff segment.

Standard Three (Continued)

5. The adequacy of staffing to achieve institutional objectives.

6. The adequacy of institutional policies governing academic freedom and responsibility, and staff awareness of the policies and their limitations because of religious or other institutional aims.

7. The extent to which collective bargaining agreements limit consultative processes on academic and professional matters. If there are agreements with faculty units, do these agreements preserve consultative processes for academic senates, where defined by law?

STANDARD FOUR: STUDENT SERVICES

These services should reflect an institutional concern for students' physical and mental health, developing their capacities and talents, motivating their educational progress, and helping them to relate to others in the campus community. The comprehensiveness of the services will depend on the purposes of the institution, the diversity of its student body, and whether students commute or live in campus residence facilities. The services should be accurately publicized through the catalog and other means.

Standard 4A

Student services are provided to enhance educational opportunities and to meet special needs of students. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

4A.1 An admissions, registration and records service which is designed to fit the purposes of the institution and the clientele served.

4A.2 A clearly defined and well publicized admissions policy, including an explicit statement on foreign student admissions which relates properly to institutional purposes.

4A.3 Articulation procedures with high schools, employers, and other postsecondary institutions to enable students to make a smooth transition in and out of the institution.

4A.4 A policy on acceptance of transfer credit which relates appropriately to the institution's educational programs.

4A.5 A records system with security against improper use, loss, or theft, including safeguarding the privacy of student records in accordance with law.

4A.6 A counseling service appropriate to institutional purposes and the clientele served.

4A.7 An organized student orientation program designed to establish an individual and personal relationship between the entering student and the institution.

4A.8 A special program for foreign students (if they are enrolled) which recognizes cultural differences, language difficulties, and other adjustment problems.

4A.9 A student activities program appropriate to the student body served and the residential or non-residential character of the campus. Special activities which meet the interests and needs of the students are properly supported, and are jointly managed by students and staff.

4A.10 A student government which operates for the benefit of all students and which provides for student participation in the governance of the institution.

4A.11 Policies establishing the role and management of student publications.

4A.12 If the institution sponsors intercollegiate athletics, policies setting forth the philosophy, regulations, and supervision of the program.

4A.13 Policies on student rights, student conduct, student grievances, and due process which are well publicized.

4A.14 A financial aids service efficiently administered, well publicized, and tailored to individual needs.

4A.15 Services for ethnic minorities and the economically or culturally disadvantaged.

4A.16 Special services and programs for the physically disabled.

4A.17 Services for special groups such as women returning to education, veterans, and older students.

4A.18 Services to meet the physical and mental health needs of students, including referral sources for students with psychological problems.

4A.19 Student and career employment services, and career information centers.

4A.20 Food, bookstore, and housing services where needed.

4A.21 Regular evaluation of the services to determine their effectiveness in meeting student needs.

4A.22 Publications which accurately describe the services.

Standard 4B

Administrators, counselors, and support staff have the qualifications to provide effective services. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

4B.1 Staff with appropriate training and experience, and with a commitment to the purposes of the institution.

4B.2 Staffing commensurate with institutional purposes, size, and level of instruction.

4B.3 Opportunities for staff development.

Standard Four (Continued)

ILLUSTRATIVE EVALUATION TOPICS AND ACTIVITIES

Each standard, if applicable to the institution, implies appropriate evaluation. The list below is intended to be suggestive rather than exhaustive.

1. The adequacy of facilities, staffing, and services to support institutional objectives and meet special needs of students.

2. The use of services by staff, students, and the community.

3. The effectiveness of particular services such as admissions and registration, counseling, financial aids, health services, student records, services to special groups, etc.

4. The use and effectiveness of student grievance procedures.

5. The adequacy and quality of published information describing student services.

6. The effectiveness of special programs such as student publications, student activities, intercollegiate athletics, student government, etc.

STANDARD FIVE: COMMUNITY SERVICES

Public community colleges have traditionally opened their facilities to community use and have provided educational, cultural, and recreational services which extend beyond the regular college credit courses. The standards provide a model for a comprehensive community services program. Public community colleges will vary in their program objectives because of differences in the type of area served and in the services furnished by other community institutions.

Specialized institutions or private colleges which do not include community services among their objectives may omit this section.

Standard 5A

Institutional policies and procedures encourage use of college facilities by the public. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

5A.1 A designated office which coordinates college and community facilities use, arranges for necessary services, and communicates appropriate information to college staff, students, and the general public.

5A.2 Facilities use by community groups for purposes of civic and personal improvement.

Standard 5B

Community service courses are integral parts of the college educational program, intended to serve people who are not reached by the credit courses.

In California public community colleges, non-credit courses offered through community services have been defined as community service classes. Other non-credit classes which are state supported are included in the Educational Programs Section (Standard Two). COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

5B.1 Community liaison to identify needs and help evaluate programs.

5B.2 Liaison with teaching divisions to avoid unnecessary duplication and help assure course quality.

5B.3 Effective techniques to publicize classes, enroll participants, select and evaluate instructors, and provide necessary materials and services to campus and community locations.

Standard 5C

A varied program of cultural activities is provided to the community, both by college and community based groups. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

5C.1 Articulation with community groups to coordinate program planning, calendaring, fund raising, and facilities use.

5C.2 Use of college facilities by community groups for co-sponsored activities.

Standard 5D

Special programs and services are designed to reach senior, ethnic, youth and other kindred-interest groups within the community.

Standard 5E

Budget, staffing, and placement in the organizational structure demonstrate recognition of community services as an institutional objective. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

5E.1 Provision for administrative leadership and necessary support staff.

5E.2 Effective planning procedures which involve college staff and community representatives.

5E.3 Budget allocations from fees, general funds, or other sources to furnish adequate financing to achieve program objectives.

Standard 5F

Community liaison is developed and maintained through community surveys, public information materials, and other appropriate methods. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

5F.1 Systematic methods of surveying community opinion to aid in program development, publicity, and program evaluation.

5F.2 An organized procedure for use of news media.

5F.3 College publications of appropriate quality and quantity.

## ILLUSTRATIVE EVALUATION TOPICS AND ACTIVITIES

Each standard, if applicable to the institution, implies appropriate evaluation. The list below is intended to be suggestive rather than exhaustive.

1. Telephone assessment of community leaders regarding knowledge of college program and, in particular, community service opportunities.

Standard Five (Continued)

2. Staff evaluation of program.

3. Student and audience evaluations of classes and events.

4. Studies of community use of facilities.

5. Effectiveness of programs which serve special community groups.

STANDARD SIX: LEARNING RESOURCES

All resources of an educational institution exist to implement the educational program and thereby accomplish institutional purposes. Learning resources include personnel who provide support services for the curricular offerings, facilities, equipment, materials, books and other software such as: the library facility with its collections, equipment, service personnel, and other resources; the instructional technology program of the institution including traditional audio-visual distribution services, materials, and equipment; and the more sophisticated electronic design/production/distribution of curricular support information; tele-communications including radio and microwave; and the computer support system. Learning resources encompass instructional development functions as well as direct instructional service.

For most institutions, learning resources are a central support to the total educational program. Both collection requirements and the service program will differ depending on the mission and program of the institution.

Standard 6A

All learning resources (print and non-print library materials, media equipment, facilities and staff) are sufficient in quantity, depth, diversity, and currentness to support all of the institution's educational offerings at appropriate levels. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

6A.1 Learning resources designed to provide support for modes of instruction suited to a variety of student needs and learning styles.

6A.2 Learning resource holdings sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the needs of the students and the objectives of the institution.

6A.3 Learning resource holdings balanced in direct relationship to the nature and level of curricular offerings.

6A.4 Periodic review of learning resource holdings and a long-range plan for meeting any deficiencies in learning resource holdings. An efficient cataloging system in place to provide students with access to materials. Obsolete materials systematically removed.

6A.5 Properly maintained equipment which is readily accessible to faculty and students. Delivery system to furnish materials and equipment.

6A.6 Computer support for instruction for programs normally requiring its use.

6A.7 Current audio-visual materials related to the curriculum and readily accessible to students.

6A.8 Assistance to faculty in the production of tests, syllabi and other classroom materials.

Standard 6B

There is an organized procedure for the selection and evaluation of learning resource materials.

Materials related to the curriculum are best developed with close cooperation among faculty, students, professional librarians, and other instructional resource personnel. The availability of appropriate materials which support learning in a variety of disciplines, presenting a wide range of factual and interpretative material, is essential. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

6B.1 Participation by staff and students in the selection and evaluation of learning resource materials.

Standard 6C

Learning resources are readily available and used by staff and students both on and off-campus.

Several patterns of organization, administration, acquisition, storage, and distribution of learning resources have demonstrated their effectiveness in institutions with diverse personnel, physical facilities, and traditions, and different levels of financial support.

Most important is the extent to which staff and students make use of all kinds of learning resources. An institution needs generous reading, viewing, and study spaces in facilities that are available at periods which are long enough and convenient to the users. This may include evening and weekend hours to accommodate the nontraditional, part-time student.

While neighboring, available libraries may augment its resources, an institution cannot rely exclusively, or even largely, on these resources unless it can influence acquisitions to support its programs or can assure continuity, consistency, and effectiveness of service for its students through formal agreements and financial commitments. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

6C.1 Collections and facilities readily available and appropriately used.

6C.2 Instructional methods and course requirements which encourage the use of the library and other learning resources.

6C.3 If off-campus programs exist, provision for students to have ready access to resource collections or their equivalents as well as the equipment for using these materials.

6C.4 Hours of service which provide convenient access to collections.

Standard 6D

A professional staff with pertinent expertise is available to assist users of learning resources.

Effective use of learning resources depends on the efforts of adequately prepared professional librarians, learning specialists, and other resource staff. The number and specializations of the staff are affected by many factors, including the number of students and faculty, the extent and variety of services provided, availability of nearby off-campus learning centers, and the physical rate of growth of the total operation. To assist users, competent personnel are needed whenever the facilities are open. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

6D.1 Professional staff adequate in number and properly qualified in various specialty areas to serve users and to provide technical support; opportunities for professional development available.

6D.2 Orientation of students, new faculty, and other users to the learning resources. Opportunities for professional development to keep all staff members current in the use of new learning resources.

## ILLUSTRATIVE EVALUATION TOPICS AND ACTIVITIES

Each standard, if applicable to the institution, implies appropriate evaluation. The list below is intended to be suggestive rather than exhaustive.

1. The adequacy of facilities, materials, staffing, and services so support institutional objectives (opinion surveys).

2. The use of the library and other learning resources by staff, students, and community.

3. The effectiveness of particular services such as computer assisted learning, audio-visual services, reading and writing centers, etc.

4. Staff participation in selecting and evaluating materials, establishing library policies, and determining the resources needed for off-campus centers.

STANDARD SEVEN: PHYSICAL RESOURCES

Special attention may be required to achieve and maintain appropriate quality facilities. Available off-campus resources may extend educational opportunity or provide useful laboratory practice or work experience to students.

Facilities also may be available for community use if this is in accordance with established policies; jointly operated and used space may often be the best way to meet a need. Efficient use of existing resources can be encouraged by space and equipment use studies.

Standard 7A

Physical resources, particularly instructional facilities, both on and off-campus, are designed, maintained, and managed so that the institution can fulfill its goals and objectives. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

7A.1 Space allocations appropriate for the institutional functions served; i.e., instruction, support services, special services, and administration.

7A.2 Buildings and grounds clean and in good repair; maintenance conducted in a systematic, planned fashion; and plant operation and maintenance adequately staffed and supported.

7A.3 Appropriate concern for safety, security, and energy conservation.

7A.4 Well-planned, adequate, and well-maintained physical facilities for off-campus programs.

7A.5 Appropriate concern for a barrier-free access to both on-campus and off-campus facilities.

Standard 7B

Equipment necessary for the educational program and services is furnished and maintained.

Instructional equipment is distributed efficiently, and unnecessary duplication of purchases by various units of the institution is avoided. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

7B.1 Equipment appropriate for the institutional functions served; i.e., instruction, support services, special services, and administration.

7B.2 Equipment maintained on a regular basis and attention given to the safety-health-security aspects of equipment operation and maintenance.

7B.3 Periodic replacement of institutional equipment scheduled, budgeted, and implemented, and adequate inventory and control maintained.

Standard 7C

Comprehensive planning for development and use of physical resources is based on educational planning.

A systematic, planned approach to the future development of facilities is needed. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

7C.1 A master plan for campus development, consistent with the objectives of the institution and its educational master plan.

7C.2 Appropriate involvement of the governing board, staff, and students in planning facilities.

## ILLUSTRATIVE EVALUATION TOPICS AND ACTIVITIES

Each standard, if applicable to the institution, implies appropriate evaluation. The list below is intended to be suggestive rather than exhaustive.

1. Relationship of the facilities master plan to the educational master plan.
2. Surveys of staff and students on the adequacy of facilities, equipment, and maintenance services.
3. Surveys to identify problems of handicapped students.
4. Provisions for safety, security, and energy conservation.

STANDARD EIGHT: FINANCIAL RESOURCES

A careful analysis of the financial condition of an institution will reveal much about its operational priorities, its effectiveness in serving students, and its prognosis for long-range quality.

Resources must be adequate to maintain the various programs to which an institution has made a commitment. Whether the institution is public or private, stability of income, demonstrated by a consistent history through at least the past three years, is fundamental. An excessive dependence upon a single source of income which lacks the expectation of stability can be detrimental.

Standard 8A

Financial resources are sufficient to support institutional objectives, maintain the quality of its programs and services, and serve the number of students enrolled. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

8A.1 Current and anticipated income adequate to maintain quality programs and services.

8A.2 Adequate planning to meet potential financial constraints.

8A.3 Reasonably accurate projections of yearly income and expenditures for the last three years.

8A.4 An operationally sound debt repayment plan.

8A.5 Adequate insurance to cover liabilities to persons and to protect physical resources.

8A.6 Reserves adequate to provide for sound fiscal management.

Standard 8B

Financial planning is based on educational planning.

The institution's plan for financing should reflect sound educational planning and a commitment to its stated objectives. Financial support for programs and services should be adequate to maintain the number and quality of personnel as well as other needed operational support. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

8B.1 A budget process providing for staff participation.

8B.2 Financial planning that reflects instructional plans and other programs of service. Budget allocations which relate to program priorities.

Standard 8C

Business management of the institution exhibits sound budgeting and control, and proper records, reporting, and auditing.

Management of financial resources should adhere to the State Accounting Manual (California Community Colleges) or other recognized accounting procedures. The process should provide for adequate safeguards in the expenditure of public (or private) funds, fiscal reports for administrative decision-making and sufficient flexibility to meet emerging needs. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

8C.1 Clearly defined organization for financial administration with specific assignments of responsibilities set forth. Provision of efficient and timely services.

8C.2 An annual audit of the institution's financial records by an independent certified public accountant. Proprietary institutions should provide, in addition, profit or loss schedules, distribution of proceeds, copies of corporate income tax returns, both state and federal, and a list of those officers and board members who have a significant equity relationship.

8C.3 Regular distribution of current financial information.

8C.4 A three-year history of operating without substantial budgeting deficiencies, or a realistic plan to achieve a balanced budget and remove accumulated deficits within a reasonable period of time.

## ILLUSTRATIVE EVALUATION TOPICS AND ACTIVITIES

Each standard, if applicable to the institution, implies appropriate evaluation. The list below is intended to be suggestive rather than exhaustive.

1. Effectiveness of budget development and control procedures.
2. Effectiveness of business office services.
3. The extent to which funding allocations reflect educational planning.
4. Adequacy of financial resources to support institutional objectives.

STANDARD NINE: GOVERNANCE AND ADMINISTRATION*

In the American system of higher education, the governing board is the legal entity charged with determining basic policies. In fulfilling this responsibility, it reflects the public interest, protects the institution from undesirable interference, and interprets the institution to its constituency.

The board defines its duties and responsibilities in an official policy statement, which should include a differentiation between the policy-making function of the board and the executive responsibilities of those who carry out those policies.

The chief executive officer provides staff leadership in developing policy proposals for board action, is responsible to the board for the execution of policy, and keeps the board informed on matters affecting the institution.

Other agencies and organizations participate in the governance of both public and private educational institutions; the state and federal governments through legislation, regulations, and funding procedures; staff organizations through senates, associations, and bargaining units; students through student government organizations. The board, with the aid of the administration, coordinates all of these diverse interests in setting the direction of the institution.

Standard 9A

The board establishes broad policies to guide the institution, selects an effective chief executive officer and administration, approves educational programs and services, secures adequate financial resources and ensures fiscal integrity, and exercises responsibility for the quality of the institution through an organized system of institutional planning and evaluation. The board is entrusted with the institution's assets, with upholding its educational mission and program, with ensuring compliance with laws and regulations, and with providing stability and continuity to the institution. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

9A.1 Review and approval of educational programs and facility master planning.

9A.2 Establishing and ensuring compliance with basic institutional policies and approving substantive change in institutional purposes and policies.

9A.3 Responsibility for the financial soundness of the institution, approving financial plans and the annual budget, and reviewing the periodic audits.

9A.4 Ensuring that only the number, types, and levels of programs, degrees, or certificates offered are those which can be provided with a satisfactory standard of quality, given the institution's resources.

*Institutions in multi-unit districts or systems should also respond to Standard Ten.

9A.5 Selection of the institution's chief executive officer after appropriate consultations.

9A.6 Approval of an academic and administrative structure or organization which serves institutional purposes, approval of basic personnel policies, and provision for the professional growth of board and staff through appropriate policies and funding.

9A.7 Representing the public interest in its trustee role but also protecting the institution, its administration, and the academic freedom of its faculty from external or internal pressures. Whether the institution is public or private, the board should have representation of the public interest.

9A.8 Provision for organized participation in governance by staff and students and continuous, open, and frank communication between and among all of the institutional constituencies.

9A.9 A policy that precludes individual participation of board members and staff in actions involving possible conflict of interest. In proprietary institutions, particular care should be used to assure that the primary commitment is to educational excellence, and that conflicts with this commitment are avoided.

Standard 9B

A primary function of administration is to provide leadership that makes possible an effective teaching and learning environment for achievement of the institution's stated purposes.

Good administration fosters continuous frank communication among the governing board, administrators, faculty, support staff, and students. It keeps the purposes and functions of the institution in focus among its constituencies and effectively uses available resources to accomplish them.

The administration strives to create working conditions and learning opportunities which permit and encourage faculty and students to concentrate on education.

The administration interprets the institution to supporting constituencies and considers seriously the concerns of such groups. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

9B.1 An administration organized and staffed to reflect institutional objectives, size, and complexity, and to provide effective management; administrative organization, roles, and responsibilities defined clearly; a chief executive officer with a major time commitment to the institution.

9B.2 Administrators qualified by education and experience to provide leadership and good management, and with access to a professional renewal program.

9B.3 Allocation of resources based upon program planning directly related to institutional objectives; appropriate priorities controlling budget and expenditures; efficient management of resources; proper implementation of statutes, regulations, and board policies; decision-making based on institutional research.

9B.4 An administration which values human resources as much as financial and physical resources, and which recruits, evaluates, and provides professional development for staff.

Standard 9C

The role of faculty in institutional governance is clearly defined.

The faculty have been chosen because of their competence in given disciplines, learning skills, and support services, and because they possess the qualifications for determining the substance of the educational program and the appropriate learning resources and student services.

If an institution follows the collegial model, the faculty have an elected body, such as an academic senate or faculty council, through which faculty positions are expressed. The public community colleges have defined roles for such senates or councils in the formation of institutional policies on academic and professional matters.* COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

9C.1 The role and composition of various policy-making, planning, and special purpose bodies clearly and publicly stated.

9C.2 A recognized voice for faculty in such academic and professional policy matters as educational program, personnel selection and evaluation, staff development, and other institutional policies which relate to faculty areas of responsibility and competence.

9C.3 A clear delineation of function between the collective bargaining agent (if applicable) and the academic senate or faculty council.**

---

* California public community colleges are referred to Title 5, Chapter 2, 53200(b). Hawaii public community colleges are referred to Regents' Policy on Faculty Involvement in Academic Decision-Making and Policy Development.

** In addition to the sources in the first footnote, California public community colleges are referred to Government Code Section 3543.2 for the scope of representation of bargaining units and Hawaii institutions to the Hawaii Public Employment Collective Bargaining Law, Section 89.3.

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has furnished a position statement on delineation of function which is included in the Appendix.

Standard 9D

The role of support staff (nonfaculty status) and of students in institutional governance is clearly defined.

Support staff possess special insights which can be helpful to the policy development process. Students have valuable opinions regarding their own needs for educational and ancillary programs. There are many patterns of governance which provide opportunities for participation by both groups. An effective institution is responsive to the views of its employees and its constituencies. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

9D.1 Provision for support staff to influence decisions which relate to their areas of responsibility and competence.

9D.2 A student governing body, if established, with well-defined responsibilities and functions.

## ILLUSTRATIVE EVALUATION TOPICS AND ACTIVITIES

Each standard, if applicable to the institution, implies appropriate evaluation. The list below is intended to be suggestive rather than exhaustive.

1. The policies and regulations of the institution for their comprehensiveness, their availability, and their contribution to the integrity of actions affecting staff and students.

2. The participation by staff and students in policy development and decision-making.

3. The degree to which policy implementation is delegated to staff.

4. The effectiveness of communication among board, staff, students and community.

5. The effectiveness with which the board represents the public interest.

6. Administrative assistance to the board in meeting its responsibilities.

7. Administrative leadership in planning the educational program, physical facilities, and allocation of fiscal resources.

8. The adequacy of administrative staffing to provide leadership and support services in achieving institutional objectives.

9. The degree to which institutional channels have been developed and adhered to in decision-making.

10. The effectivenss of the academic senate or council.

STANDARD TEN: DISTRICT OR SYSTEM RELATIONSHIPS

Over one-half of ACCJC's member institutions are in multi-unit systems, some at the local district level and some at the state level. In addition to the public system colleges, independent multi-unit organizations are applying for membership.

Historically, ACCJC has accredited operationally separate units, not systems. The growth of multi-college districts in California, the development of the state system in Hawaii, and applications from other types of systems necessitates increasing attention to the appropriate role of the systems office and its relationship with the operating units, both in the accreditation self-study and in the evaluation and review process. Standard Ten is designed for that purpose.

Standard 10A

The system has an official set of objectives, policies which define system-college relationships, and an organizational plan which establishes lines of authority and allocates reponsibilities. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

10A.1 A procedure for continuing review of educational objectives and provision for appropriate participation in the review by system constituents.

10A.2 Mechanisms, procedures, and channels for policy development, revision and implementation adopted by the governing board and published as part of the policy document.

10A.3 Organizational charts, policy statements, and job descriptions which define the role of the governing board and the system officers, and which establish their relationships to the colleges or operating units. Similar type materials which relate the operating units to the system.

Standard 10B

The system has communication methods, both internal and external, which provide for the flow of information in a timely and efficient manner. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

10B.1 Agendas and minutes of governing board meetings and system coordination meetings maintained and available in convenient locations.

10B.2 An appropriate means for providing information to both college and district constituents.

10B.3 Published instructions on the use of system and college communication channels.

10B.4 Procedures which provide for systematic communication from the colleges to the system office.

Standard 10C

The system has an organized process for coordinating program development and evaluation, facilities planning, and budget development and administration. COMPONENTS TYPICALLY INCLUDE:

10C.1 Procedures for program development, coordination, and evaluation at both the college and system levels.

10C.2 Procedures for facilities planning, construction, and maintenance.

10C.3 Procedures for budget development, resource allocation, and budget administration.

Standard 10D

The system develops and publishes appropriate policies and agreements governing employment, compensation and benefits, working conditions, staff evaluation, and staff transfer and reassignment. (See ACCJC policy on "Accreditation and Collective Bargaining.")

## ILLUSTRATIVE EVALUATION TOPICS AND ACTIVITIES

Each standard, if applicable to the institution, implies appropriate evaluation. The list below is intended to be suggestive rather than exhaustive.

1. Comparative studies of policies and procedures in other systems.
2. Opinion surveys of groups served by the system.
3. Effectiveness of public information methods and materials.
4. Consultant studies of system organization and administration.
5. Understanding of system communication methods and channels.

## PART III - INSTITUTIONAL SELF-STUDY

Institutional self-evaluation and planning are essential in the accrediting process. The Commission standards which represent a "model of good practice," are provided as a framework for the self-study. In responding to the standards, the institution will be seeking answers to these basic questions:

1. Are the institution's objectives clear, appropriate, and useful? Are they understood and accepted? Are they compatible with the accepted goals of postsecondary education?

2. Are the programs and services consistent with the objectives? Are they designed to achieve the objectives and are they working well? How can they be improved?

3. Are the resources (human, physical, and fiscal) adequate to support the programs and services? Will they continue to be available?

4. Are the objectives being achieved? What changes are needed to improve achievement? What are the planning priorities?

The self-study is an analysis and synthesis of the institution's on-going process of evaluation and planning. It should be realistic, candid, and comprehensive.

The self-study process normally requires at least a full academic year. The completion date should be set so that copies of the report will reach team members and the Commission office 45 days before the evaluation visit. Suggestions for organizing the self-study are included in the Appendix.

Four models of self-study reports are provided: (1) The Comprehensive Report, (2) the Fifth-Year Review or Candidacy Renewal Report, (3) the Special Project Report, (4) the Interim or Substantive Change Report.

### THE COMPREHENSIVE REPORT - FORMAT AND CONTENT

Institutions seeking candidacy or initial accreditation are expected to submit this report. Institutions seeking reaffirmation of accreditation will use this model unless they are eligible for fifth-year options which are explained in a later section.

1. Cover Sheet. Name and address of the institution, a notation that the self-study is in support of an application for candidacy, accreditation, or reaffirmation, and the date submitted.

2. Table of Contents.

3. Certification of the Self-Study Report. The Certification of the Self-Study Report indicates to the Commission that in preparing the report of institutional self-study there was broad participation

by various elements of the campus community such as administrative officers, faculty and support staff, together with appropriate involvement of trustees, students, and the public, and that the report accurately reflects the nature and substance of the institution. A sample certification form is included in the Appendix.

4. Abstract of the Report. This should be a summary statement not more than four to six pages long. It should describe briefly the important educational and institutional developments since the acceptance for candidacy or since the most recent evaluation team visit. It should summarize, in a paragraph or two, compliance with each of the applicable standards, and the planning being done by the institution.

5. Organization for the Self-Study. Describe, in narrative or chart form, the organization that was established to conduct the self-study. Show committees, their chairmen and members, time schedule followed, and under whose specific direction the self-study was conducted and any observable impact of the process.

6. Descriptive Background and Demographics. A concise and factual description of the institution. (Studies that provide detailed information of this kind should be made available in the team room.)

   The demographic material should include summary data on the area served and the enrollment, including trends.

7. Responses to Recommendations from the Most Recent Evaluation. If the institution has had a previous evaluation visit, the report must indicate succinctly in a separate section what has been done regarding recommendations made in the last team report. Cross-references to supporting sections of the current self-study will be helpful.

   Recommendations represent the observations of a visiting team at the time of the visit and should be considered in the light of the Commission's standards and the institution's educational objectives. A college may concur or disagree with a team's suggestions; if it disagrees, a rationale should be offered.

8. Institutional Self-Evaluation Using Commission Standards. For each numbered and lettered standard of the Commission, please organize materials in two major sections: (1) Description, and (2) Self-Appraisal and Plan of Action. Descriptive material should in every case include statements and evidence regarding compliance with the standards or provide explanations or justification for deviations. For example, specialized or unique institutions may find certain standards inappropriate, in which case the burden of proof rests on the institution. Evidence should demonstrate that the institution is accomplishing its published objectives and that these objectives are appropriate to post-secondary education and consonant with Commission standards.

In its self-study, an institution may, if it chooses, present separate sections for each division or department in the appropriate portions of the self-study, especially "Educational Program" and "Staff," or may present these in a general overview. It should be understood, however, that in most cases, especially in larger institutions, a visiting team will not attempt to review all departments or divisions even though these are reported separately in the self-study.

The Self-Appraisal and Plan of Action should provide a critical analysis or evaluation, conclusions, and recommended plans of action, and should forecast progress toward solutions of problems.

9. List of Supplemental Documents Available in Team Room.

THE FIFTH-YEAR OR CANDIDACY RENEWAL REPORT - FORMAT AND CONTENT

1. Cover Sheet. Name and address of the institution, a notation that the report is in support of one of the above applications, and the date submitted.

2. Table of Contents.

3. Certification Page. The Certification of the Self-Study Report indicates to the Commission that in preparing the report of institutional self-study there was broad participation by various elements of the campus community such as administrative officers, faculty and support staff, together with appropriate involvement of trustees, students, and the public, and that the report accurately reflects the nature and substance of the institution. A sample certification form is included in the Appendix.

4. Organization for the Self-Study. Describe, in narrative or chart form, the organization that was established to conduct the self-study. Show committees, their chairmen and members, time schedule followed, and under whose specific direction the self-study was conducted and any observable impact of the process.

5. Descriptive Background and Demographics. A concise and factual description of the institution. (Studies that provide detailed information of this kind should be made available in the team room.)

   The demographic material should include summary data on the area served and the enrollment, including trends.

6. Responses to Recommendations from the Most Recent Evaluation. A brief description of the action on each recommendation. Recommendations represent the observations of a visiting team at the time of the visit and should be considered in the light of the Commission's standards and the institution's educational objectives. A college may concur or disagree with a team's suggestions; if it disagrees, a rationale should be offered.

7. Significant Changes Since the Most Recent Evaluation. A brief summary of important changes in purposes, programs, staffing, services, resources, organization, and governance.

8. Evaluation and Planning Activities Since the Most Recent Evaluation. A summary of the evaluation and planning projects in which the institution has been engaged, and the impact on the institution. Include any plans for changes in the next five years. Reference to supplemental documents where appropriate.

9. List of Supplemental Documents Available in Team Room.

THE SPECIAL PROJECT REPORT - FORMAT AND CONTENT

1. Cover Sheet. Name and address of the institution, a notation that the report is submitted as a fifth-year review option, and the date submitted.

2. Table of Contents.

3. Certification Page. The certification of the special project report indicates to the Commission that there was broad institutional participation in the special project, and that the report accurately describes the results of the study and its value to the institution. A sample certification form is included in the Appendix.

4. Organization for the Project. Describe, in narrative or chart form, the organization that was established to conduct the project. Show committees, their chairmen and members, time schedule followed, and under whose specific direction the project was conducted and any observable impact of the process.

5. Descriptive Background and Demographics. A concise and factual description of the institution. (Studies that provide detailed information of this kind should be made available in the team room.)

   The demographic material should include summary data on the area served and the enrollment, including trends.

6. Responses to Recommendations from the Most Recent Evaluation. A brief description of the action on each recommendation. Recommendations represent the observations of a visiting team at the time of the visit and should be considered in the light of the Commission's standards and the institution's educational objectives. A college may concur or disagree with a team's suggestions; if it disagrees, a rationale should be offered.

7. Description of the Project. The emphasis in the narrative description should be on the evaluation and planning activities conducted as part of the project.

8. List of Supplemental Documents Available in Team Room.

## THE INTERIM OR SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE REPORT - FORMAT AND CONTENT

### Interim Reports

Instructions on the content of an interim or progress report are contained in the letter to the institution following the Commission's review of its accredited status. The report should be in narrative form with a covering letter signed by the chief executive officer.

### Substantive Change Reports

An institution anticipating a change in such substantive matters as form of control, introduction of programs at a more advanced level, a move to a new location, the establishment of major off-campus units, significant departures from stated purposes, or the contracting with other organizations for them to administer programs, is asked to consult with the Commission through the Executive Director. The institution may be requested to submit a report on the planned change for Commission review. The Executive Director will provide instructions on the report.

DOCUMENTATION FOR COMPREHENSIVE ACCREDITATION VISITS

(Candidacy, Accreditation, Reaffirmation of Accreditation)

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

A list of the supporting documents to be provided for use by the evaluation team should be included with the self-study report. Those marked (X) should be included with the self-study mailed to the team and the Commission office. Those marked (O) should be available in the on-campus team workroom during the visit. Others on the list are suggestive, not required; institutions should add documents which will be useful to the team.

STANDARD ONE: GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

(O) 1. Inventories of staff, student, and community opinions regarding institutional objectives.

(O) 2. Institutional publications which contain goals and objectives.

STANDARD TWO: EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

1. Educational Master Plan.

(X) 2. College catalog.

(O) 3. Membership lists of curriculum-development bodies and advisory committee groups, with rules of procedure and recent minutes.

4. Samples of course outlines and syllabi.

(O) 5. Evaluation data or follow-up studies regarding effectiveness of programs.

(O) 6. Reports of any individual program accreditation visits in last five years, with documentation of resulting action.

7. Academic calendar, and any studies regarding its acceptance.

(X) 8. Current class schedules.

9. Grade distribution studies.

(O) 10. Sample program brochures or flyers.

(O) 11. Agreements for contract programs.

STANDARD THREE: INSTITUTIONAL STAFF

(O) 1. Board policies.

(O) 2. Administrative procedures.

(O) 3. Handbooks for faculty, administrators, and support staff.

(O) 4. Collective bargaining agreements.

(O) 5. Constitutions of staff organizations.

6. Settlements, judgments, or consent decrees resulting from litigation and/or arbitrations affecting personnel policies and practices.

7. Higher Education Staff Information Report (EEO6).

STANDARD FOUR: STUDENT SERVICES

(O) 1. Organization chart of student services.

(O) 2. Student handbook.

3. Student government constitution.

4. Student conduct code.

(O) 5. Student grievance procedures.

6. Student publications.

7. Recruitment materials.

8. Admission and registration materials.

9. Student characteristics studies.

(O) 10. Follow-up studies of transfer and occupational students.

11. Special service publications.

STANDARD FIVE: COMMUNITY SERVICES

(O) 1. The master plan for community services development, including program objectives.

2. The past three-year budget history displayed in a comparative manner.

3. Advisory committees and their activities.

(O) 4. For California community colleges, institutional reports on community services required of California community colleges under provisions of SB 1644 and the voluntary reports requested by the Chancellor's Office by authority of sections 71064 and 71069 of the Education Code.

(O) 5. Community surveys.

(O) 6. Annual reports.

STANDARD SIX: LEARNING RESOURCES

1. Printed leaflets or brochures that describe the learning resource facilities, hours and services.

2. Information on staff such as the number of professionally trained personnel, number of support staff, full-time equivalents of student workers, and how the time of each group is divided between administrative, technical, and public activities.

3. Information on learning resource utilization.

(O) 4. Budget information for the past three years.

STANDARD SEVEN: PHYSICAL RESOURCES

(O) 1. Campus master plan and maps.

2. Equipment replacement schedules.

3. Space utilization studies.

4. Planning committee minutes.

5. Materials describing off-campus facilities.

6. Deferred maintenance schedules.

STANDARD EIGHT: FINANCIAL RESOURCES

(O) 1. Current fiscal year budget. (Note: If the institution has prepared its budget in program format this can be more helpful than the required object format and should be made available.)

2. Adopted budgets for the immediate past three years.

(O) 3. The annual audit for the immediate past year prepared by an independent auditing firm.

4. Year-ending fiscal reports for the immediate past three years.

5. A copy of Fiscal Data Abstract prepared by the State Chancellor's office for the immediate past year (California Community Colleges only).

6. Statement of present indebtedness, with projections for the future relating to principal and interest requirements for each year.

7. Endowment for the past five years, including both book value and market value.

STANDARD NINE: GOVERNANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

1. Examples of board policies.

(O) 2. Examples of board agendas and minutes of meetings.

3. Faculty manual and handbook for supporting staff.

(O) 4. Administrative manual and job descriptions.

(O) 5. Salary schedules.

6. Descriptions of staff renewal programs.

(O) 7. Organization charts for institutional administration.

8. Constitutions of faculty senate and other staff and student organizations.

(O) 9. Master contracts with employee bargaining units.

10. Description of institutional committee structure and methods of membership selection.

STANDARD TEN: DISTRICT OR SYSTEM RELATIONSHIPS

(O) 1. Board agendas and minutes.

(O) 2. Board policy manual.

(O) 3. Organization charts.

4. Procedure manuals.

(O) 5. Public information materials.

(O) 6. Minutes of system coordination meetings.

(O) 7. System budgets and financial reports.

(O) 8. System planning documents.

## PART IV - EVALUATION TEAMS, VISITS, AND REPORTS

The visit of an evaluation team to an institution that has completed its self-study is the next stage in the accreditation process. The independent insights of a team of professional peers, based on careful reading of the institution's self-study and a brief but intensive on-site evaluation, can serve to:

1. Confirm and validate many of the conclusions of the self-study.

2. Call attention to problem areas inadequately recognized by the college itself.

3. Assure the Commission that the institution has been responsive to recommendations of previous visiting teams, and has developed sound evaluation and planning procedures.

4. Reinforce and extend the college's commitment to its continuing pursuit of excellence.

5. Assure the Commission that the institution merits candidacy, accreditation, or reaffirmation of accreditation, or advise the Commission that the team cannot recommend such action.

Because of the importance of these judgments in maintaining the quality of education in all institutions, the report to the institution and to the Commission deserves the best efforts of the evaluation team.

Voluntary accreditation at relatively low cost is made possible by the cooperation and unpaid effort of hundreds of people who serve on evaluation teams. The counsel of outside observers is invaluable to the institution visited; moreover, the visitors themselves and their colleges benefit from new insights that result from the visit.

### Scheduling Evaluation Visits

An evaluation visit to a college is scheduled by the Commission at a time mutually agreed upon.

1. Authority for assigning the academic year in which an institution is to be visited for evaluation purposes is vested in the Accrediting Commission. The institution is notified by the Executive Director.

2. The Executive Director arranges with the institution the date for an evaluation visit within the assigned year. It is imperative that the college be in session and the president on campus during the entire visit.

3. Evaluation team visits are normally scheduled for a period of three successive days in order to allow adequate time for interviews, class visitations, team discussions, and report writing. The team meets in the afternoon or evening prior to the first day of the visit to review member assignments, discuss the institutional

self-study report, examine supplementary materials in the team room, and plan the visit schedule.

Selection of Visiting Teams

1. To assist in the selection of visiting team chairmen and members, records of competent personnel are maintained by the Commission office. Institutional chief administrators, academic senate officers, and other institutional leaders are invited to submit nominations of personnel for evaluation team membership.

2. The size and complexity of the institution being evaluated will determine the number of persons on the team. One or more representatives of appropriate governmental agencies may work with a team evaluating California community colleges.

3. The list of proposed team chairmen is reviewed by the Accrediting Commission. The chairman may choose a non-voting assistant at no expense to the Commission.

4. About six months prior to the visit, the Executive Director invites the team members.

5. An institution may request inclusion of a support staff (classified) representative on the team. A student representative may be requested if the expenses are borne by the institution.

6. Certain state bodies, charged by law with periodic examination of specialized programs, may request that representatives named by them participate in evaluation visits. It is the responsibility of these agencies to supply the Commission office with the names of their representatives.

7. Qualified persons are sometimes brought from other parts of the United States to provide benefit and counsel to institutions in the Western region.

8. Institutions offering programs accredited by specialized accrediting agencies may arrange for representatives of such agencies to visit the college at the same time as the Commission evaluation team. The Commission office should be consulted in order that the proper coordination may be achieved.

9. With the approval of the institution being visited and the chairman of the visiting team, one or two observers may be selected to accompany the team. Expenses of observers are borne by their own institutions. If the arrangement is mutually agreeable, the chairman of the team may use the observer as an additional resource on the visit, but the observer does not vote on team recommendations.

Institutional Responsibilities

1. Review the team composition for possible conflict of interest. Discuss any problems with the Executive Director.

2. Mail self-study report and attachments to visiting team members and the Commission office at least 45 days before the scheduled visit, in accordance with instructions from the Executive Director.

3. Make arrangements with team chairman for lodging of team members near the college.

4. Alert staff and students to the nature and purposes of the forthcoming visit, and make time available to meet the team's requests.

5. Provide a private room for the visiting team for the duration of its visit.

6. Assemble and index by Standard materials suggested under "Supporting Documents." Place in team meeting room.

7. Schedule and announce, after consultation with the team chairman, a time when representatives of the team will be available to meet with any member of the campus community.

# TEAM CHAIRMAN RESPONSIBILITIES

## BEFORE THE VISIT

| | Task | Timing |
|---|---|---|
| ____ | Early communication with institution to arrange lodging, campus headquarters room, team schedule, open meeting time to be publicized, etc. (ACCJC will pay expenses for advance visit, if desired.) | 45 to 60 days prior |
| ____ | Survey team for assignment preferences (form provided). | 45 days prior |
| ____ | Review self-study, previous team report, and most recent annual report. | as early as possible |
| ____ | Team assignments. | 30 days prior (after receiving self-study) |
| ____ | Instructions to team on housing, transportation, assignments, schedule, initial meeting time and place. | 30 days prior |
| ____ | Communication with specialized agency representatives (where appropriate). | 30 days prior |
| ____ | Team orientation meeting (videotape available). Be sure team members have all necessary materials. | |

## DURING VISIT

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| ____ | Meetings with district or system representatives (where appropriate). | |
| ____ | Meeting with governing board. | |
| ____ | Frequent progress meetings for team. | |
| ____ | Meeting with chief administrator to review findings. | |
| ____ | Team meeting to arrive at recommendation and sign recommendation form. | morning, last day |
| ____ | Team members draft reports on assigned topics. | before departure |
| ____ | Meeting institutional representatives (observations and comments, but not the team recommendation). | afternoon, last day |
| ____ | Final team meeting (if necessary). | before departure |

## FOLLOWING VISIT

| Task | Timing |
|---|---|
| ____ Draft report to team, institution, ACCJC, and district (where applicable). | within two weeks |
| ____ Submit expense form to ACCJC. | your choice |
| ____ Final report to ACCJC with team recommendation form and covering letter (if special conditions are recommended by team). | within 4 weeks |
| ____ Team member evaluation forms to ACCJC. | within 6 weeks |

Instructions for Team Members

1. Before the Visit

   a. Team members should bear in mind that the institution is to be evaluated in light of its own stated objectives, Commission standards, and accepted purposes of postsecondary education, and that there may be considerable variation among good institutions in different communities serving different constituencies. Recommendations of team members should not be rigid or prescriptive, but rather suggestions for the improvement of the college. The function of the team member is to listen and to learn about the college and to view it within the context of its stated objectives. Team members should remember that any information gained about an institution from its own self-study and from this visit or reports of prior visits is confidential.

   b. Team members should approach the task with the realization that the chief values to the institution come from a thorough institutional self-study and from the quality of the evaluation team's analysis of the college. The evaluation team report should represent an independent validation of the conclusions reached by the institution in its self-study. The comments and suggestions made in the evaluation report should therefore be clear and specific without being unduly prescriptive.

   c. The Executive Director will send appropriate materials to the members of the evaluation team before the visit.

   d. About a month prior to the visit, team members will receive a copy of the institutional self-study report, abstract, catalog, and class schedules from the institution.

   e. In advance of the visit, team members should familiarize themselves with the institution's self-study report and make notes of matters which need further study or clarification.

   f. Prior to the visit, team members will be contacted by the chairman in order to obtain their preferences on assignments, inform them of housing arrangements, and notify them of the time they are to arrive and where they are to assemble.

2. During the Visit

   a. Team members are expected to arrive on time and to be present for the entire visit, including the chairman's oral report to the college on the final day. A member who accepts an invitation to serve on a visiting team thereby agrees to stay for the full visit.

   b. The chairman will arrange the initial meeting, allowing sufficient time to review team assignments, discuss thoroughly the institutional self-study report, and plan the visit schedule. This meeting should be held the afternoon or evening before the first day of the scheduled visit.

c. Team members are expected to devote most of their time to the assignments agreed upon in advance. Particular attention should be given to matters where the team believes there is greatest need of improvement.

d. Although an effort may be made to attend a number of classes (in institutions where such visits are appropriate), it is not possible to visit every class or meet with every member of the faculty. Since all or many members of the faculty will have shared in the preparation for the evaluation visit, all should be aware of the presence of the evaluation team and have opportunity to communicate with members.

e. During the visit, particular attention should be given to the extent that the college has carried out or reacted to recommendations made in the last evaluation report. Team members should note carefully the sections in the institutional self-study report that describe action taken on, or responses to, earlier recommendations. It is important to remember, however, that there may be instances in which the college has not agreed with a team recommendation. In such cases the college report should state the reasons.

f. The team should establish times and a place where any member of the college community may appear to talk to a team member or members. Student leaders and students selected at random should be interviewed.

g. Above all else, there should be an attempt to evaluate the educational process -- what is happening to the students in the classroom, laboratory and the college environment generally, and whether this is not only effective but also in line with the institution's purposes and objectives. The team should evaluate the institution's own evidence of institutional achievement.

h. As part of its assignment, the visiting team members should assess the quality of the institution's self-study.

3. Reimbursement to Evaluation Team Members

The Executive Director is authorized to reimburse each evaluation team member for travel, food, and lodging expenses. Members who represent a governmental agency and whose expenses are covered by the agency will not be reimbursed by the Commission. There is no honorarium paid to evaluation team chairmen or members.

A claim form will be furnished by the Executive Director and should be returned to the Commission office as soon as possible after the visit. Vouchers for public transportation and for lodging should be attached.

## THE COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION TEAM VISIT AND REPORT

Under the direction of the chairman, the evaluation visit follows a pattern similar to these suggested procedures:

1. Initial Meeting of the Visiting Team

   The work begins the afternoon or evening before the first day of the scheduled visit with a team meeting in the room assigned by the institution for the team's exclusive use.

   At the first planning session, the visiting team will review assignments, examine supplementary materials, arrange the schedule, and discuss the self-study report of the institution. The planning session is covered more fully in the sections "Team Chairman Responsibilities" and "Instructions for Team Members."

2. Meeting with the Institutional Staff

   The first day of the visit the team will meet with the administration, the self-study steering committee, and other members of the college staff who were most involved in preparation of the self-study report.

   At the meeting:

   a. The general plan of the visit is arranged.

   b. Any questions the team members may have about the institutional self-study report are clarified.

   c. The chief administrator of the institution provides assistance in arranging a schedule of meetings between team members and individuals or groups such as the governing board, faculty, administration, classified staff, students, and other persons.

   This meeting may be followed by a brief tour of the campus, in order that team members may become familiar with the physical plant and the locations for campus appointments. Care must be taken that this be brief; campus maps made available to team members can aid greatly in orientation.

   An evaluation visit is a work assignment; hence, social functions or entertainment should not be provided for the evaluation team. However, if the institution desires, the team may be invited to a dinner or a luncheon at which they may meet members of the board of trustees or others, such as representative staff and students.

3. Remainder of the Visit

   a. Team members will arrange conferences, make class visits (if appropriate), hold individual interviews, and attend evaluation discussions scheduled by the chairman. Class schedules should be available and staff contacts arranged. Schedules of faculty office hours would be helpful.

b. One or more progress meetings of the evaluation team should be held at intervals during the visit to summarize the work accomplished and to plan for the remainder of the time.

c. In the late morning or early afternoon of the final day the team will meet, review accomplishments, and make final plans for the preparation of its evaluation report. At this meeting, a private one, decisions will be made as to the team's recommendation on accreditation and other major suggestions and comments which are to be discussed with staff members and included in the evaluation report. Drafts of the individual team members' written statements on their assignments should be completed at this time or, in any event, before the team disbands. The team holds a final meeting with such persons as the chief administrator selects. At this meeting, the chairman offers constructive suggestions from the team. The institution representatives are encouraged to respond, react, or raise questions for clarification. (Before this meeting, the team chairman is encouraged to go over the suggestions of the team with the chief administrator of the college in order to avoid errors of fact.)

Under no circumstances should the visiting team's recommendation concerning candidacy or accreditation of the institution be revealed, for this must be acted upon by the Commission before the official outcome of the visit is determined. The final meeting with the staff is the team's best opportunity to be of immediate service to the college while the entire evaluating process is fresh in the minds of all present. The chairman will speak for the team. Team members should be present to answer questions that may arise.

4. Subsequent to the Visit

a. Following the visit and prior to the submission of the final evaluation team report, communication between the institution and the evaluation team should be carried on only by the chairman of the team.

b. After the team report is filed with the Commission, the institutional constituency should communicate exclusively with the Executive Director of the Accrediting Commission.

5. Reports of Evaluation Visits

a. Nature of Evaluation Team Reports

The main purpose of the evaluation report is to help an institution determine how effectively it is achieving its stated goals and objectives. To achieve this purpose the team report should be clear and specific; the source of evidence for each recommendation should be noted. The recommendations contained in the report represent the observations of the team at the time of the visit. Recommendations should be considered

in light of the institution's educational objectives. The institution may prefer other solutions to the problems defined.

b. Preparing the Evaluation Report

Each team member, before he leaves the campus, should submit his written statement to the chairman. As soon as possible after the visit, the chairman prepares the entire report, drawing upon the material submitted by the team members.

The evaluation report is not usually a lengthy document. It is concerned largely with unusual characteristics of the institution, with unique programs of instruction, unusual facilities, especially effective forms of organization and instruction, and the like. It sets forth the limitations and difficulties which the institution is experiencing and the plans and potential it has for overcoming them.

The Commission emphasizes that the time of the members of the visiting team and that of the institution is wasted and the function of the accreditation program defeated if the team glosses over or ignores problems. The report should be frank and constructive.

The following reminders will assist the chairman in the preparation of the report:

i. Evaluate the institution in the light of its own stated objectives and Commission standards. The wide variations in the capabilities, interests, needs, and circumstances of students require corresponding variations in the institutions serving them.

ii. Make favorable comments when commendation is due, without assuming it necessary to find a point of weakness to counterbalance each item of praise, or vice versa.

iii. Remember that the purpose of the report is both to justify the recommendation on candidacy or accreditation and to provide a fair and useful estimate of the effectiveness of the institution.

iv. Include a separate and clearly identified summary of the conclusions of the team about the college, and a list of the major recommendations approved by the team. This summary should accompany the draft report sent to the team, the institution, and the Executive Director of the Commission.

v. Concentrate on fundamental issues. Of prime importance will be the sections which respond to the institution's stated objectives and which furnish evidence of the effectiveness of the educational process.

c. Special Concerns

i. Do not name individuals, either in prise or blame. Comment, if necessary, on the office, not the office-holder.

ii. Do not advocate your own pet educational theories or those of other team members.

iii. Neither advocate nor advise against specialized accreditation.

iv. Neither advocate nor advise against any membership organization.

v. Never cite the formulas or requirements of other agencies. Their ideas often are useful to the institution, but the Commission is not their enforcement agent, nor are their rules considered to be uniformly applicable.

vi. Never reveal in the report what the team's recommendation for Commission action on candidacy, accreditation, or reaffirmation will be. Since the team does not make the final decision, confusion and embarrassment may result if a team recommendation is revealed which may be altered or reversed by the Commission.

vii. Avoid lavish praise or bitter criticism; strong language may be used if needed, but not as satire or condemnation.

viii. Do not foster special interests of team members.

ix. Avoid, if possible, a complete reversal of recommendations made by the previous team. Sometimes a team feels that a previous team's recommendation was unwise or inappropriate, but, if an institution has attempted to comply with that recommendation, it would be unfair to the institution and a discredit to the accreditation process if a reversal is too abruptly advised. In such cases a diplomatic way must be found to advise the institution toward the better course without creating confusion.

x. Do not make specific suggestions to remedy problems. A brief statement of the problem is usually sufficient, leaving the specific remedy to be worked out by the institution.

d. Recommendations of the Team

Both the chairman and the team should understand that their recommendation may be revised by the Commission when it makes the final decision. The Commission will not ordinarily change it without consulting the chairman of the visiting team.

Finally, it should be remembered that, in arriving at its decision, the Commission will consider all available information with heavy reliance on the institutional self-study and the evaluation team report, realizing that each of the specific recommendations made in the team report represents the observations of qualified evaluators.

The institution will be urged to examine each recommendation in the light of its own educational posture and to use the report for the improvement of the institution.

A college may concur or disagree with any part of the evaluation report, but hopefully it will be used for institutional improvement. To achieve this end, the report should be given wide distribution within the college community. An institution should avoid quoting only those portions of the report favorable to itself, especially in publications that go off campus.

# THE FIFTH-YEAR VALIDATION VISIT AND REPORT

1. Institutional Reports

   Institutions preparing fifth-year reviews are asked to organize their reports under four topics:

   a. Introduction, including the organization of the self-study and demographic information about the institution.

   b. Responses to recommendations of the previous team.

   c. Major changes since last evaluation visit.

   d. Planning for the future of the institution.

2. The Validation Visit

   The task of the validation team is not a comprehensive review of the institution. Rather, the team is asked to validate the accuracy and usefulness of the report. Recommendations should be focused on improvement of the evaluation and planning process.

3. Methodology

   Much of the team time should be spent in meeting with groups representing the major campus constituencies. Key groups would include committees which prepared the report, faculty senate or other representative faculty body, management, classified representatives, student representatives, and trustees. Questions should be designed to elicit responses on participation in the study; significant changes since the last visit; evaluation projects, particularly those that impact on planning; understanding of planning goals; and support of the institution's published objectives.

4. Previous Team Recommendations

   Team members should be assigned responsibility for verifying the responses to the recommendations in the previous team report. Institutions are not obligated to accept every recommendation; however, if a recommendation is rejected, there should be an explanation. A check-off system should be used to ensure coverage.

5. The Team Report

   The team report should include:

   a. Summary page

      An introductory paragraph on the institution followed by brief statements on these points:

i. Extent of campus participation in, and understanding of, the institutional report.

ii. Responses to previous recommendations.

iii. Significant changes.

iv. Quality and usefulness of institutional evaluation and planning.

v. Recommendations for improving evaluation and planning.

b. Narrative

Explanation, elaboration, and documentation on above five topics.

c. Team Recommendation on Accreditation Status

(Use form.)

d. Covering letter which includes any supplemental team recommendations concerning interim reports and/or special visits.

# THE SPECIAL PROJECT VISIT AND REPORT

1. Institutional Reports

Institutions preparing special project reports are asked to cover the following topics:

a. Introduction, including the organization for the special project study and demographic information about the institution.

b. Responses to the recommendations of the previous team.

c. Description of the project emphasizing the evaluation and planning activities conducted and their impact on the development of the institution.

2. The Validation Visit

The task of the validation team is not a comprehensive review of the institution. Rather the team is asked to validate the accuracy and usefulness of the report. Recommendations should be focused on improvement of the evaluation and planning process.

3. Methodology

Much of the team time should be spent in meeting with groups representing the major campus constituencies. Key groups would include committees which prepared the report, faculty senate or other representative faculty body, management, classified representatives, student representatives, and trustees. Questions should be designed to elicit responses on participation in the special project, understanding of the implications of the report, and support of the planning goals which resulted from the project.

4. Previous Team Recommendations

Team members should be assigned responsibility for verifying the responses to the recommendations in the previous team report. Institutions are not obligated to accept every recommendation; however, if a recommendation is rejected, there should be an explanation. A check-off system should be used to ensure coverage.

5. The Team Report

The team report should include:

a. Summary page

An introductory paragraph on the institution followed by brief statements on these points:

i. Extent of campus participation in, and understanding of, the institutional report.

ii. Responses to previous recommendations.

iii. Quality and usefulness of the special project.

iv. Recommendations for improving evaluation and planning.

b. Narrative

Explanation, elaboration, and documentation on above four topics.

c. Team Recommendation on Accreditation Status

(Use form.)

d. Covering letter if the team has any supplemental recommendations concerning interim reports and/or progress visits.

# THE INTERIM VISIT AND REPORT

1. Institutional Report

   The Commission instructs the institution on the content of special reports in its letter of notification regarding accredited **status**. The team will be provided with a copy of this letter.

2. The Visit

   The team is asked to validate the accuracy and completeness of the institutional report.

3. The Team Report

   Content should include a brief description of the institution; a summary statement of the Commission's requirements for the report; a description of the team review process; an evaluation of the quality and completeness of the report; any recommendations regarding the matters addressed in the report; ard concerns to be considered in the next institutional self-study and evaluation visit. The team is not asked to make a formal recommendation to the Commission regarding the accreditation status of the institution.

## THE SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE VISIT AND REPORT

1. Institutional Report

   The Commission instructs the institution on the content of its report. A copy of the letter will be furnished to the team.

2. The Visit

   The team is asked to validate the accuracy and completeness of the institutional report.

3. The Team Report

   Content should include a brief description of the institution; identification of the substantive change; an account of the team review process; the team's judgment on whether the change is in conformity with institutional purposes and whether adequate academic and financial planning has occurred; identification of issues and problems which the institution should address; and any recommendations to the Commission regarding further monitoring of the substantive change.

## PART V - COMMISSION PROCEDURES FOR ACCREDITATION ACTIONS

### Procedures with Team Reports

The Executive Director sends a copy of each team report to members of the Accrediting Commission in time for study before the next Commission meeting.

The Executive Director sends the final evaluation report to the administrative head of the institution. Although the chief executive has already received the draft copy, this advance copy of the official report affords an opportunity for the chief executive officer to send a letter to the Executive Director before Commission action is taken. If the chief administrator desires, a meeting with the Commission can be arranged through the Executive Director. If this is requested, the team chairman will also be invited to be present.

The team report is considered confidential until Commission action is taken.

### Team Recommendations

In arriving at its decision, the Commission will consider all available information with special reliance on the institutional self-study and the evaluation team report.

Both the chairman and the team should understand that their recommendation may be revised by the Commission when it makes the final decision. The Commission will not ordinarily change it without consulting the chairman.

### Notification of Accreditation Actions

Immediately following Commission meetings, each institution which has been evaluated receives an official notification of the decision regarding its accredited status. The institution is urged to consider each team recommendation and to use the evaluation report for the improvement of the institution. To achieve this end, the report should be given wide distribution within the college community.

A summary of Commission actions is distributed to ACCJC member institutions and to appropriate agencies and organizations. Each year the Western Association of Schools and Colleges publishes a directory of accredited institutions.

### Review of Decisions

Institutions whose applications for candidacy, renewal of candidacy, accreditation, or reaffirmation of accreditation are denied, or whose candidacy or accreditation is terminated, may request a review of the Commission's decision. Such a review must be requested prior to filing

an appeal to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. Review procedures are explained in the policy statement on pages 86-89.

Appeal of Decisions

If an institution has used the review procedure and remains aggrieved, it may file an appeal with the Western Association of Schools and Colleges through the ACCJC Executive Director. The WASC Constitution which is included in the Association Annual Directory contains the appeal procedures (see policy section for a copy).

## PART VI - COMMISSION POLICIES

The following pages are the policies which apply to an institution being considered for candidate for accreditation, initial accreditation, or reaffirmation of accreditation by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges.

## PURPOSES OF INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION
(Adopted October, 1972)

Institutional accreditation at the postsecondary level is a means used by regional accrediting commissions for purposes of:

1. Fostering excellence in postsecondary education through the development of criteria and guidelines for assessing educational effectiveness.

2. Encouraging institutional improvement of educational endeavors through continuous self-study and evaluation.

3. Assuring the educational community, the general public, and other agencies or organizations that an institution has clearly defined and appropriate educational objectives, has established conditions under which their achievement can reasonably be expected, appears in fact to be accomplishing them substantially, and is so organized, staffed, and supported that it can be expected to continue to do so.

4. Providing counsel and assistance to established and developing institutions.

5. Protecting institutions against encroachments which might jeopardize their educational effectiveness or academic freedom.

Accreditation is attained through a process of evaluation and periodic review of total institutions conducted by regional commissions in accord with national policies and procedures.

## COORDINATION AMONG WASC COMMISSIONS
(Adopted January, 1974)

### Commission of Jurisdiction

1. For an institution which offers secondary and postsecondary programs, the Community College Commission may assume jurisdiction, consulting with the Schools Commission.

2. For a new institution which offers lower-division programs but moves to four-year and graduate levels, the Senior Commission will assume jurisdiction, consulting with the Community College Commission.

### Evaluation and Recognition

1. When an institution has been accredited or recognized as a candidate by the Community College Commission and moves to a higher level, the two commissions will cooperate in making evaluations under the jurisdiction of the Senior Commission.

2. The institution will continue to be listed under the original designation until the total institution qualifies for recognition by a higher commission. Then it will come under that commission's jurisdiction.

3. Institutions will be listed in only one place in the WASC and COPA directories.

## RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GENERAL AND SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

(Adopted October, 1964, Revised January, 1978)

Each institution must be free to decide for itself whether or not to seek accreditation by any particular agency. If an institution desires both general (regional) accreditation and specialized program accreditation, the Commission may collaborate with the specialized accrediting agency in arranging joint visitation and exchange of information.

An institution should not interpret its general accreditation as validating a specialized program in the same manner as specialized accreditation, which by its very nature is a more intensive evaluation process.

A specialized institution may request regional accreditation through ACCJC if it meets the Commission's conditions for eligibility.

## PUBLIC ACCESS POLICY
(Adopted June, 1978)

Meetings of the Commission are open to the public, except when it is deliberating and acting on matters concerning specific individuals or institutions. Institutional representatives and other interested persons are invited to attend these meetings at which the Commission considers, among other matters, all questions of policy and procedure.

The Executive Director will mail a preliminary agenda 45 days before each regular meeting of the Commission to the chief executive and liaison officer of all candidate and accredited institutions approved by the Commission with the request that the agenda be posted or otherwise publicized.

Observers will be seated at Commission meetings as space allows. If they wish to speak, observers must give advance notice to the Executive Director and include the agenda item which they wish to address. Any specific reference to an individual or to an institution must be made in executive session, and the individual or institution will be given an opportunity to be present or to have a representative present. Verbal participation by observers at Commission meetings is limited to:

1. Prepared statements noted by the Executive Director in the agenda at appropriate places. Written copies of all prepared remarks should be left with the Executive Director.

2. Brief comments on specific points in the public agenda, given at the end of Commission discussion of the same topic.

Individuals who wish to bring items to the attention of the Commission which are not on the agenda should present, not less than 30 days before Commission meetings, a written statement to the Executive Director with a request that said item(s) be placed on the agenda. If individuals wish to meet with members of the Commission, they should so advise the Executive Director not less than 30 days before the Commission meeting. The Executive Director will then, time constraints permitting, arrange for two Commissioners to meet with the individual(s) to discuss the matter(s) of concern preceding the meeting of the Commission. The two Commissioners will report to the Commission as a whole and may recommend a presentation before the full Commission at an appropriate time.

## CODE OF COMMISSION GOOD PRACTICE AND ETHICAL CONDUCT
(Adopted June, 1980)

In carrying out its functions, the Commission has established a code of good practice, both for its relations with institutions which it serves, and with regard to its internal organization and procedures.

In its relations with the institutions it accredits, the Commission is committed to:

1. Make an initial visit to, or evaluation of, an institution only on the written request of the chief executive officer of the institution.

2. Revisit an institution only on request by the chief executive, or, if a visit is initiated by the Commission, after due notice to the institution.

3. Permit withdrawal of a request for initial candidacy or initial accreditation at any time (even after evaluation) prior to final action by the Commission.

4. Appraise institutions in the light of their own stated purposes so long as these are within the general frame of reference of postsecondary education and consistent with the standards of the Commission.

5. Use relevant qualitative and quantitative information in evaluation.

6. Interpret standards for accreditation in ways that are relevant to the character of the particular institution, respecting institutional integrity and diversity.

7. Encourage sound educational innovation.

8. Assist and stimulate improvement in the educational effectiveness of the institution.

9. Emphasize the value and importance of institutional self-study.

10. Conduct evaluation visits by experienced and qualified examiners under conditions which, insofar as reasonably possible, assure impartial and objective judgment, avoiding conflict of interest.

11. Include on evaluation teams representation from other institutions of similar purpose and academic program.

12. Provide institutions an opportunity to object, for cause, to individual members assigned to the team designated to visit the institution, with special concern for possible conflict of interest.

13. Consider the names of evaluators recommended for service on a particular team or for general accrediting service.

14. Arrange consultation during the visit with administration, staff, students, and trustees, and include a publicized opportunity for an open hearing during the visit.

15. Protect the confidentiality of the institutional self-study and evaluation team report. An institution, at its discretion, may make such documents public. In event of a negative action, the Commission staff will attempt to reach agreement with the institution on a statement for public distribution, but the Commission reserves final authority in case of an impasse. Should the institution issue selective and biased releases or use the public forum to take issue with negative actions, the Commission and its staff will be free to make all the documents public.

16. Provide opportunity for the institution to respond in writing to the team report before it is completed, and to appear before the Commission when it is considered. The Commission staff will notify an institution in writing as soon as reasonably possible regarding Commission decisions.

17. Provide an opportunity for institutional representatives and the general public to attend those portions of Commission meetings devoted to policy matters and others of a non-confidential nature.

18. Encourage discussion and use on campus of major team recommendations.

19. Revoke accreditation only after advance written notice to the institution.

20. Provide opportunity for Commission review of its negative decisions, and, in addition, for appeal of such decisions to a panel established by the WASC Board.

21. Refrain from conditioning candidacy or accreditation upon payment of fees for purposes other than annual fees and evaluation costs.

22. Encourage continuing close relationships and communication between the Commission and institutions through the establishment of liaison officer positions in each institution, with appropriate visibility and responsibility.

The Commission insists that its members recognize their ethical responsibilities by accepting and subscribing to the defined purposes of accreditation; respecting the confidentiality of relationships between the Commission and the institutions it accredits; refraining from discussing institutional matters learned through the accrediting process with anyone other than commissioners, the staff, the visiting teams, and the institutions concerned; protecting the confidentiality of all documents that come from the staff in preparation for meetings, or that are distributed at meetings when these are clearly of a confidential nature; and committing themselves to full disclosure and restraint in any

Commission consideration involving conflict of interest. Members of the Commission will absent themselves from deliberations or vote on decisions regarding the individual institutions of which they are employees or trustees. They shall not participate in deliberation or vote on decisions in which they have any other personal interest that might reasonably appear to suggest divided loyalties or otherwise impair their independent, unbiased judgment. Any such potential conflict of interest shall be reported to the Commission by the commissioner in advance of deliberation and/or action and shall be recorded in the Commission minutes. Any commissioner who is uncertain regarding the possible appearance of conflict of interest shall request the Commission to determine the matter by majority vote. Such request and decision shall be duly noted in Commission minutes.

These restrictions are not intended to disqualify participation by a commissioner in the general run of cases which do not directly or substantially affect the institution with which he/she is associated or its competitive position with a neighboring institution under review.

The Commission expects that Commission members will accept and carry out the responsibilities of membership, including:

1. Attending, when possible, all Commission meetings for their entire duration.

2. Studying documents as assigned prior to the meetings and serving as readers by arrangement.

3. Voting according to best personal judgment in the light of existing policy.

4. Respecting the confidentiality of relations between the Commission and the institutions it accredits.

5. Assisting in interpreting accreditation.

6. On occasion accepting appointment to the Senior and the Schools Commissions, to the WASC Board, and to membership on evaluation teams.

7. Serving on ad hoc or permanent committees of the Commission.

8. Assisting the staff in training programs and other activities.

9. Resigning from the Commission if circumstances change so that time no longer permits the full responsibilities of membership.

10. Absenting themselves from deliberations or vote when a potential conflict of interest exists because of affiliation, previous relationships or consultant services.

## COMMISSION PROCEDURES IN MATTERS OF INSTITUTIONAL ETHICS AND INTEGRITY

(Adopted January, 1976)

Accrediting commissions have an obligation to assure themselves that any institution which seeks candidacy, accreditation, extension of candidacy, or reaffirmation of accreditation conducts its affairs with honesty and frankness.

When the Commission has cause to believe that any institution with which it is concerned is acting in an unethical manner or is deliberately misrepresenting itself to students or public, it will investigate the matter and provide the institution an opportunity to explain the alleged abuse. If, on the basis of such investigation and after notice to the institution and opportunity for institutional response, the Commission finds that an institution has engaged in unethical conduct or that its integrity has been seriously undermined, the Commission will:

1. With regard to an institution which is an applicant, but is not yet a candidate or accredited, break off relations.

2. With regard to a candidate or an accredited institution, either

   a. Issue a show cause order with a time stated, or

   b. In extreme cases, immediately sever its relationship with the institution by denying or terminating candidacy or accreditation.

The institution may appeal the decision of the Commission in accordance with the WASC appeals process.

## ACCREDITATION OF INSTITUTIONS AND SYSTEMS
(Adopted October, 1972, Revised June, 1980)

ACCJC and the other regional commissions have historically accredited colleges or schools rather than districts or systems. In accord with this position, institutions which are under the general control of a parent institution or a central administration in a multi-unit system are classified as operationally separate and require separate accreditation if they:

1. Have an organizational structure which is not a part of another unit in the system and which includes a core of full-time faculty, a separate student body, and a resident administration.

2. Offer a program or programs leading to certificates and/or degrees.

Such units will be listed separately in regional and national directories. The Commission reserves the right to make the final judgment on the determination of separate units.

Units classified as operationally separate which currently share the accreditation of a parent institution or system continue in that status until they can be examined. ACCJC will schedule evaluations as soon as practicable. New operationally separate units are expected to seek separate affiliation or accreditation.

Newly founded units in multiple-campus systems and institutions not previously accredited which merge or affiliate with an accredited institution are not considered accredited if they are operationally separate as defined above. These institutions are expected to seek affiliation or accreditation through the usual procedures.

Programs not classified as operationally separate by ACCJC are included in the Commission's evaluation of the parent institution, regardless of location. Commissions in other regions where such programs are located may be invited to send representatives.

The above policies for the accreditation of operationally separate units apply to locations within the United States and in foreign countries.

### System Accreditation

ACCJC will consider proposals to vary from the practice of accrediting colleges or units where a district or system presents arguments which, in the judgment of the Commission, justify system-wide accreditation. A proposal to accredit all of the individual colleges in a district or system during the same time period will also be considered.

A proposal should address realistically the task of evaluating a total system with peer volunteers who can give only a limited time to this type of assignment. It must include consideration of such matters as the historic identity of the operational units, the size and diversity of the system, team size, number of days required for the team visit, involvement of other WASC commissions, relative roles of the system and the operating units in the process, etc. The proposal should be developed in consultation with the Commission Executive Director and should satisfy the following criteria:

1. Faculty and support staff from the operating units should be involved in developing the proposal.

2. The self-study process should provide for broad participation by the various constituencies in the evaluation and planning activities.

3. The governing board of the system must approve the proposal.

4. A plan for evaluating the effectiveness of the accreditation project should be included.

System accreditation necessarily requires that the accredited status of the total system may be affected by serious weaknesses in any of the operating units.

The fee for system evaluation will be based on actual expenses of the team visit plus an amount to cover the special costs to the ACCJC office. The annual membership for the system would be the sum of the applicable charges for the operating units.

## INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION LIAISON OFFICER
(Adopted June, 1974)

Each accredited and candidate institution should designate a campus accreditation liaison officer to work with the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges and coordinate all accreditation activities. The chief administrator may name a person from the staff or assume this responsibility. The accreditation liaison officer can provide an effective means of communication between the institution and the Commission and more direct participation in the accreditation process.

The duties of the accreditation liaison officer are:

1. To coordinate the institution's self-study and other preparations made in advance of initial or renewal of accreditation, assist in follow-up studies resulting from the evaluation, and notify the Commission of substantive changes and program developments as they occur.

2. To meet occasionally with the Commission staff to discuss policies, procedures, and other matters pertaining to evaluation and accreditation.

3. To provide an identified person on campus to disseminate information and answer questions about evaluation and accreditation.

4. To assist in the preparation and sending of the institutional annual report to the Commission.

5. To assist the institution in the coordination of accreditation activities for regional and specialized agencies.

Presidents may prefer to delegate the responsibility to a member of the college faculty or administrative staff who is interested in evaluation and accreditation, and who will report to the president on all relevant activities.

The accreditation liaison officer should receive a suitable degree of visibility on campus.

## INSTITUTIONAL INTEGRITY

(Adopted October, 1966, Revised, January, 1978)

By academic tradition and by philosophical principle an institution of postsecondary education is committed to the pursuit of truth and to its communication to others.

To carry out this essential commitment calls for institutional integrity in the way an institution manages its affairs--specifies its goals, selects and retains its faculty, admits students, establishes curricula, determines programs of research, fixes its fields of service.

The maintenance and exercises of such institutional integrity postulates and requires appropriate autonomy and freedom.

Put positively this is the freedom to examine data, to question assumptions, to be guided by evidence, to teach what one knows--to be a learner and a scholar. Put negatively this is a freedom from unwarranted harrassment which hinders or prevents an institution from getting on with its essential work.

An educational institution must be managed well and remain solvent, but it is not a business nor an industry. It must be concerned with the needs of its community and state and country, but it is not a political party nor a social service. It must be morally responsible, but even when church related, it is not a religion nor a church. Those within it have as a first concern evidence and truth rather than particular judgments of institutional benefactors, concerns of churchmen, public opinion, social pressure, or political proscription.

Relating to this general concern and corresponding to intellectual and academic freedom are correlative responsibilities. On the part of trustees and administrators there is the obligation to protect faculty and students from inappropriate pressures or destructive harrassments.

On the part of the faculty there is the obligation to distinguish personal conviction from proven conclusions and to present relevant data fairly to students because this same freedom asserts their rights to know the facts.

On the part of students there is the obligation to sift and to question, to be actively involved in the life of the institution but involved as learners at appropriate levels. The determination and exercise of proper responsibilities will be related to the students' status as undergraduate, professional, or graduate students.

Intellectual freedom does not rule out commitment; rather it makes it possible and personal. Freedom does not require neutrality on the part of the individual nor the educational institution--certainly not toward the task of inquiry and learning, nor toward the value systems which may guide them as persons or as schools.

Hence, institutions may hold to a particular political, social, or religious philosophy as may individual faculty members or students. But to be true to what they profess academically, individuals and institutions must remain intellectually free and allow others the same freedom to pursue truth and to distinguish the pursuit of it from a commitment to it.

All concerned with the good of postsecondary educational institutions will seek for ways to support their institutional integrity and the exercises of their appropriate autonomy and freedom. The regional commissions, which have a particular responsibility to look at an institution in its totality, will always give serious attention to this aspect and quality of institutional life so necessary for its well-being and vitality.

## SPECIAL INSTITUTIONAL REVIEWS AND CONSIDERATION OF COMPLAINTS
(Adopted June, 1972)

Accreditation by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges is an expression of confidence that an institution is satisfactorily achieving its objectives and is coping with its problems. However, there may be circumstances which require special review by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, WASC.

1. ACCJC may request an interim report or schedule a special visit or an earlier full team visit if, in the judgment of the Commission, substantive changes in the institution or conditions seem to justify a reevaluation of a college's efforts to solve specific problems. Topics or areas to be considered will be delineated when the report is requested and/or a visit is scheduled.

2. Disruption of the work of an institution by forces beyond its control, although not condoned, will not result in summary loss of accreditation. Prolonged inability, for whatever reasons, to conduct its academic programs will require a review of the institution and a reconsideration of its accreditation.

3. ACCJC procedures to be followed on complaints or requests from non-official sources for investigation concerning alleged injustices or unethical practices by accredited institutions will depend upon the nature of the charges and the evidence offered. Only substantially supported allegations of practices which could seriously retard the progress of the institution and affect the quality of its educational program will be considered.

   The Commission determines its own methods of review and action. It will not intervene on behalf of individuals in cases of disciplinary action or dismissal, or act as a court of appeals in such matters as admission, credits, fees, and academic standards unless the context suggests unethical or unprofessional action which may seriously impair or disrupt the educational services of an accredited institution.

   If the alleged circumstances do appear to be of serious nature, the ACCJC Executive Director will review the matter with the Chairman of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, and may conduct a confidential inquiry with the knowledge of and in conference with those concerned.

4. Should the report of an evaluation team, an interim visit team, or special deliberations of the Commission lead to a recommendation to withhold accreditation or to change existing accreditation status, the institution has available the review and appeal procedures of ACCJC and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. (See Article VI, "Appeals," WASC Constitution.)

## SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE
(Adopted October, 1972, Revised January, 1978)

A substantive change in an accredited institution is defined as one which affects significantly the nature of the institution, its objectives and educational programs, and the allocation of its resources. Substantive changes include, but are not limited to, the following: Changes in form of control of the institution; offering of programs at a more advanced level; a move to a new location, or establishment of major off-campus units; the initiation of external degree programs; significant departures from stated purposes and/or educational programs operative at the time of the most recent evaluation.

An institution planning a substantive change is asked to consult with the Commission through its Executive Director. The institution and the Commission may then take the steps necessary to assure an orderly transition consistent with ACCJC's policies. Substantive change may involve a review of the accredited status of the institution by the Commission.

## COMMISSION DECISIONS ON INSTITUTIONS

Once the Commission has made a decision regarding candidacy or accreditation of an institution, it will notify the institution in writing as promptly as possible. The forms of possible Commission action with regard to institutions are:

1. An institution is granted candidacy or is accredited.

2. Its candidacy is extended or its accreditation is reaffirmed.

3. Its candidacy is not renewed or its accreditation is terminated.

4. The institution is placed on probation effective at a specific date.

5. It is given a show cause order, with accreditation to terminate unless response or compliance has satisfied the Commission prior to a specified date.

6. The institution's application for candidacy or accreditation is denied.

All such Commission actions are made public and are published in appropriate manners. In addition, an institution may be given a private warning if Commission concerns are significant but less serious than those calling for probation.

If an institution so conducts its affairs that they become a matter of public concern, or uses the public forum to take issue with a negative action of the Commission relating to that institution, the Commission may announce, through the Executive Director the action taken, and the basis for that action, making public any pertinent information available to it.

NEGATIVE ACTIONS OF THE COMMISSION
(Adopted January, 1977, Revised June, 1978, June, 1980)

When measured against the criteria or policies of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, an institution may, in the opinion of the Commission, be found wanting. The nature and gravity of the deficiency will determine whether or not in the judgment of the Commission one of the following five negative actions should be taken.

1. Candidacy or Accreditation Withheld. The candidacy or accreditation of an initial applicant or reapplicant institution may be withheld by a deferral or a denial.

   a. A deferral is not a final decision. It is interlocutory in nature to provide further guidance and time for the institutions to correct certain deficiencies.

   b. A denial is a final decision which is subject to review by the Commission and subsequent appeal to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges under the published policies and procedures of these two bodies.

2. Warning. When the Commission finds that an institution has pursued a course deviating from the Commission's criteria or policies to an extent that gives concern to the Commission, it may issue a warning to the institution to correct its deficiencies, refrain from certain activities, or initiate certain activities within a stated period of time. A warning does not affect the candidate or accredited status of the institution.

3. Probation. When a candidate or accredited institution fails to respond to conditions imposed upon it by the Commission, including a warning, or when it deviates significantly from the Commission's criteria or policies but not to such an extent as to warrant a show cause order or the withdrawal of candidacy or accreditation, it may be placed on probation for a specified period of time. While on probation, the institution will be subject to special scrutiny by the Commission, including a requirement to submit periodic prescribed reports and special visit(s) by representatives of the Commission. If the institution has not taken steps satisfactory to the Commission to remove the cause or causes for its probation at the end of the specified time, the Commission will issue a show cause order. Probation does not affect the candidate or accredited status of the institution.

4. Show Cause. When the Commission finds an institution to be in substantial non-compliance with its criteria or policies or when the institution has not responded to the conditions imposed by the Commission, the Commission may ask the institution to show cause why its candidacy should not be terminated or be allowed to lapse or its accreditation withdrawn at the end of a stated period. In such cases, the burden of proof will rest on the institution to demonstrate why its candidacy or accreditation

should be continued. Wh[illegible]e, the institution will be subject to speci[illegible] the Commission, including a requirement to submit [illegible] reports and special visit(s) by representatives [illegible]. A show cause order does not affect the candidate [illegible] status of the institution.

5. Revocation of Candidacy or Termin[illegible]on of Accreditation. If, in the judgment of the Commission, an institution has not satisfactorily explained or corrected matters of which it has been given notice, its candidacy may be revoked or allowed to lapse or its accreditation terminated. In such a case, the institution must complete again the entire accreditation process to qualify for candidacy or accreditation. Non-renewal or revocation of candidacy or termination of accreditation is subject to review and appeal under the applicable policies and procedures of the Commission and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. If an institution's candidacy is not renewed or is revoked or if its accreditation is terminated, its status will continue unchanged if it requests a review and later an appeal until the review and appeal processes have been completed. Otherwise, its candidacy or accreditation ends on the date when the time period permitting such a request expires.

In all cases of negative action, the Commission will give the institution written reasons for its decision.

The Commission will announce publicly, as appropriate, through its Executive Director and will publish in the WASC Bulletin and in the WASC annual Directory the status of each institution subject to a negative action (except warning) in accordance with the Commission's policy on "Disclosure and Confidentiality of Information," as revised in November, 1975. The Executive Director will attempt to reach agreement with the institution on a public statement to be used by both parties. However, the Commission reserves final authority in event of impasse.

If a specific inquiry is made about an institution which has been warned, placed on probation, or issued a show cause order, the Executive Director shall inform the inquirer that a negative action has been taken and the reasons therefore.

## REVIEW OF COMMISSION ACTIONS
(Adopted January, 1977, Revised January, 1979)

Institutions whose applications for candidacy, renewal of candidacy, accreditation, or reaffirmation of accreditation are denied or whose candidacy or accreditation is terminated by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges may request a review of the Commission's decision. Such a review must be reques . prior to filing of an appeal by the institution to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. The following procedures will govern the conduct of the Commission's review:

1. If the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges decides to take any of the actions listed above, its Executive Director will notify the institution concerned of the decision by certified mail, return receipt requested, within approximately seven calendar days of the Commission's decision. Said notification shall contain a succinct statement of the reasons for the Commission's decision.

2. If the institution wishes a review by the Commission, it shall file with the Executive Director a request for such a review under the policies and procedures of the Commission. This request should be submitted by the chief executive officer of the institution and, in the case of private institutions, co-signed by the chairman of the governing board. Requests for review by an institution in a multi-college system shall be co-signed by the chief executive officer of the system. This request must be received by certified mail, return receipt requested, within twenty-eight calendar days of the date of the mailing of the Commission's notification to the institution of its decision.

3. Within twenty-one calendar days after the date of its request for a review, the institution, through its chief administrative officer, must submit a written statement of the reasons why, in the institution's opinion, a review of the Commission's decision is warranted. As a general rule, this written statement should respond only to the Commission's statement of the reasons for the Commission's decision and to the evidence that was before the Commission at the time of its decision. However, if the institution believes that there are compelling reasons to expand the scope of the response or if it wishes to introduce new evidence which may have been generated or discovered since the time of the Commission's decision, it may do so in a separate section of its response.

4. On receipt of the institution's written statement referred to in paragraph 3, the Chairman of the Commission will select a Review Committee of three or more persons. A roster of the Review Committee will be sent to the institution normally within twenty-one calendar days of the date of the Commission's receipt of the institution's written statement.

5. Within a reasonable period of time after the Review Committee has been selected, the Executive Director will schedule a visit to the institution by the Review Committee.

6. Prior to the visit to the institution, the Review Committee will review available information. If additional information is needed, the Chairman of the Review Committee may request such information from the chief executive officer of the institution.

7. The Review Visit will be investigative and designed to determine if the Commission's decision was substantially supported by the evidence before the Commission at the time of the Commission's decision. If, however, in the judgment of the Review Committee, changes have occurred which might materially affect the decision of the Commission, the Review Committee Chairman, with the approval of the members, may accept new evidence bearing on these changes.

8. The Committee should open and close its visit with a meeting with the chief executive officer of the institution. At the closing meeting the Chairman should, among other matters, attempt to ascertain whether or not the institution has any complaints about any aspect of the visit.

9. The Committee should prepare a report which cites and evaluates the evidence which the Committee considers relevant to the question of whether the Commission's original decision was substantially supported by the evidence before the Commission at the time of its decision. If the Committee accepts evidence of changes which occurred subsequent to the Committee's original decision, the Review Committee should include a summary and analysis of such evidence in its report identifying it as new evidence and describing the weight given it.

10. The Chairman of the Review Committee will submit a copy of the Committee's report which is referred to in paragraph 9 to the chief executive officer of the institution, the chairman of the institution's governing board, and the Executive Director of the Commission, normally within twenty-one calendar days of the end of the Review Committee's visit.

11. Within fourteen calendar days of the institution's receipt of the Review Committee's report, the chief executive officer may submit a written response to the Executive Director of the Commission, with a copy to the Chairman of the Review Committee. Failure of the institution to submit a response shall constitute an acceptance by the institution of the Commission's original decision.

12. In a confidential letter to the Commission, the Review Committee shall make one of the following recommendations:

    a. The decision of the Commission was substantially supported by the evidence before the Commission at the time of the Commission's decision.

    b. The decision of the Commission was not substantially supported by the evidence before the Commission at the time of the Commission's decision.

    c. The decision of the Commission was substantially supported by the evidence available at the time of the Commission's decision but the institution has taken significant steps to improve conditions and remedy deficiencies and the Commission should reevaluate its decision in light of these steps.

    The recommendation of the Review Committee to the Commission shall not be disclosed to the institution being reviewed. The recommendation is not binding on the Commission.

13. The chief executive officer of the institution and a limited number of his staff will be invited to meet with the two readers of the Committee's report and the Chairman of the Review Committee shortly before the meeting of the Commission at which the report will be acted upon. Discussion at this preliminary meeting will be confined to the report of the Review Committee referred to in section 9 and the institution's response to this report.

14. The two readers will report the substance of this meeting to the Commission when it meets. If institutional representatives wish to appear before the Commission at that time, their request will be granted, but the meeting with the readers is intended to obviate the need for such an appearance except in unusual circumstances.

15. In making its decision on the institution's status, the Commission will consider the evidence available to it and then reach a final decision to (a) reaffirm its original decision; (b) modify it; or (c) reverse it. As soon after the meeting as practicable, the Executive Director will notify the chief executive officer of the institution by certified mail of the Commission's decision.

16. The decision of the Commission referred to in paragraph 15, shall be final as far as the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges is concerned. However, if the institution remains aggrieved, it may file an appeal with the President of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges through the Executive Director of the Junior Commission in accordance with the provisions of Article VI of the Constitution of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges.

17. An institution retains its accredited or candidate status until the review process of the Commission is completed. If the institution files a subsequent appeal with the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, its status remains unchanged until that appeal has been heard and decided.

18. The cost of the review will be borne by the institution. The request for a review must be accompanied by a depost of $1,000. If the actual cost is less than this amount, the excess will be refunded. If it is greater, the institution will be billed for the difference.

## WASC APPEALS PROCEDURES

The WASC appeals procedures are being reviewed by the Association. A revised copy will be furnished in the near future. In the interim, consult with the Executive Director if you have questions.

a. The President of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges shall then arrange a hearing at the earliest practicable date for the representatives of the institution before the Association's Hearing Board, established for this purpose as prescribed in Article VI, Section I, of this Constitution.

b. This hearing shall be informal and conducted under rules and procedures established by the WASC Board of Directors. Those testifying will not be placed under oath. Legal counsel may be present as advisors but they will not be expected to conduct the case as in a formal judicial proceeding.

c. At least twenty (20) calendar days before the time set for the hearing of such an appeal, the President (or Secretary-Treasurer) of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges must cause notice of the time and place of the hearing to be mailed by registered or certified mail, return receipt requested, to the chairman or president of the governing board of the institution with a copy to the chief executive. Proof of notice must be made at the hearing.

d. Subject to limitations set forth below, representatives of the institution will have an opportunity to present written documents, other evidence on the institution's behalf, oral testimony, and arguments. Representatives of the appropriate Commission and of the evaluation team will have a similar opportunity to present evidence, oral testimony, and arguments on the Commission's behalf.

e. The Hearing Board, in addition to considering evidence adduced at the hearing, will also consider the institution's self-study report, the evaluation team report, and all other material relied upon by the Commission in reaching the decision which is being appealed.

f. The appeal shall be based on one or more of the following grounds: (1) there were errors or omissions in carrying out prescribed procedures on the part of the evaluation team and/or the Commission which materially affected the Commission's decision; (2) there was demonstrable bias or prejudice on the part of one or more members of the evaluation team or Commission which materially affected the Commission's decision; (3) the evidence before the Commission prior to and on the date when it made the decision which is being appealed was materially in error; or (4) the decision of the Commission was not supported by substantial evidence.

g. The appeal shall be heard on the record and confined to actions taken by the institution and the Commission up to and through the date of the Commission decision which is being appealed. Only evidence and documentation which were before the Commission on that date may be introduced.

h. The Hearing Board shall make its decision by a vote of the majority on the basis of the admissible evidence and arguments presented to it at the hearing.

(1) If the Board finds for the institution on one or more of grounds (1) through (3) of Section 2f above, the Board shall remand the case to the appropriate Commission for reconsideration.

(2) If the Board finds for an institution on ground (4) of Section 2f above, it shall either remand the case to the appropriate Commission for reconsideration or, in the appropriate instance, grant the appeal and direct the Commission to take action which will effectuate the decision at its next meeting.

(3) If it finds against the institution on any of the four grounds in Section 2f above, it shall deny that portion of the appeal which is based on that ground.

(4) If the Board orders reconsideration, the appropriate Commission will reconsider the matter according to procedures it may adopt for this purpose. The Commission's decision following such reconsideration shall be final.

i. At the conclusion of its deliberations, the Hearing Board shall issue its decision and the reasons therefor within thirty (30) calendar days and inform, by registered or certified mail, return receipt requested, the President of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, the chairman of the governing board of the institution, and the Executive Director of the Commission concerned. Such decision shall be final.

## DISCLOSURE AND CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION
(Adopted January, 1976, Revised June, 1978)

It is the obligation of every institution applying for candidacy, extension of candidacy, accreditation, or reaffirmation of accreditation and of every candidate or accredited institution to provide the Commission with access to all parts of its operations, with due regard for the rights of individual privacy, and with complete and accurate information with respect to the institution's affairs, including reports of other accrediting, licensing, and auditing agencies. Failure to do so, or to make complete, accurate, and honest disclosure, is sufficient reason in and of itself to deny or revoke candidacy or accreditation.

The Commission will maintain inviolate the confidentiality of information supplied by the institution except in those rare cases where it is deemed necessary by the Commission to make public information which forms a substantive basis for the Commission's decision.

The Commission may announce publicly, as appropriate, through its Executive Director and will publish in the WASC Bulletin and/or annual Directory the fact that:

1. An institution has been granted candidacy or accredited.

2. Its candidacy has not been extended or its accreditation reaffirmed.

3. Its candidacy has not been renewed or its accreditation has been terminated.

4. The institution has been placed on probation.

5. The institution has been given a show cause order effective at a specific date.

6. The institution's application for candidacy or accreditation has been denied.

If an institution so conducts its affairs that they become a matter of public concern, the Commission may announce, through its Executive Director, any action the Commission has taken and the basis for that action, making public any pertinent information available to it.

## GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS IN SPECIALIZED PROGRAMS
(Adopted March, 1973)

This policy expresses a principle of general education which is considered to be a desirable characteristic of postsecondary* institutions. By design, the policy is qualitative rather than quantitative. No formula for specific application or particular pattern of general education is endorsed, since this determination is considered to be the prerogative of the institution.

General education is recognized as an important component of all postsecondary educational programs. Postsecondary institutions must identify and provide a recognizable core of general education that expresses the educational philosophy of the institution for each degree program or cluster of degree programs. In some cases, institutions may provide for general education degree requirements through admission or graduation prerequisites. Institutions are encouraged to include general education in non-degree specialized programs.

General education may include educational experiences which provide introduction to the major areas of knowledge; opportunity for acquiring the skills and knowledge necessary for living in a complex modern society; and opportunity for the development of basic learning skills and foundations necessary for success in mastering advanced specialized subject matter.

General education in specialized degree programs shall be of collegiate level. The content of general education in specialized degree programs should be comparable, though not necessarily identical, to traditional academic offerings and should be taught by appropriately qualified faculty.

Programs in postsecondary vocational-technical institutions need to evidence recognition of the relationship between broad education and the acquisition of techniques and skills. While an appropriate level of mastery in occupations and technologies is recognized as fundamental, every worthy institution should also strive for the development of student character, and the preparation of its students to live in the world. Programs need to develop within students the capabilities of forming independent judgments, weighing values, and understanding fundamental theory, in addition to amassing facts and mastering skills. The institutional effort in helping its students become contributing and useful members of society, other than through its specific occupational and technical offerings, should be demonstrated in the performance of the institution's graduates. In any type of program, the general education courses, as well as vocational-technical courses, should be taught by staff members who are qualified in the subject being taught.

General education designed specifically for specialized programs should be clearly and accurately described in official publications of the institution.

---

* Postsecondary education consists of those educational experiences available to persons who have completed secondary school requirements or who are of post high school age.

## ACCREDITATION AND NONTRADITIONAL STUDY
(Adopted March, 1973)

Accreditation procedures for nontraditional programs should encourage innovative and imaginative approaches to providing quality education whether in new institutions or in those already accredited. The accrediting process generally should move toward assessment of the results of education rather than its processes, and developments in nontraditional studies and degrees provide opportunities to do so. At the same time, the regional accrediting commissions emphasize that accreditation is concerned with institutional improvement and that attention to outcomes only, without considering the relation of these to the environments and educational processes, would be of little assistance to either traditional or nontraditional programs in raising questions and providing suggestions for improvement.

The commissions believe that, at this early stage in the development of nontraditional degree programs, the principles, policies, and procedures specified for accreditation must be flexible and of an interim nature. As the nature of innovative developments becomes clarified and experience is gained in working with them, accreditation policies and procedures can be adjusted to attain a uniform approach to the traditional and the innovative in such manner that the better procedures of each are called to the attention of both. In this context, the statement of policies and principles presented here is tentative and interim. It is a working set of guidelines which will require continued monitoring, clarification, and revision as experience in their application evolves.

### General Policies

1. Accreditation will be considered only when a number of individuals have been granted or have qualified for a degree by various nontraditional patterns indicated. Consideration of students' completed programs and student reactions are deemed indispensable to accreditation.

2. Accreditation procedures and criteria should be comprehensive, flexible, and fair. Evaluation committees should include persons who have experience in nontraditional programs and/or who are sufficiently conversant and understanding to review innovations competently.

3. An institution which, by the nature of its program, abandons or renders nonfunctional traditional criteria and mechanisms of review and control aimed at assuring quality must accept responsibility for indicating alternative ways in which quality will be assured.

Guidelines

1. When degrees based heavily on nontraditional patterns of study are offered, evidence will be required that the degrees are awarded on the basis of definite criteria and demonstrated competency commensurate with the level and nature of the degrees.

2. The appraisal, evaluation or examination procedures of an institution must be conducted with a high degree of objectivity, with due regard for maintenance of honesty and security, and with explicit statements of criteria and standards for judging satisfactory performance. The learner's self-appraisal of the worth of an experience is a valuable but not sufficient basis for awarding credit or a degree.

3. Publicity statements to prospective students must be factual. For example, actual services provided must be consistent with publicity. This will require monitoring adjunct professors to assure that they fulfill their commitments.

4. To protect the integrity of the faculty-institution work relationship and to avoid circumstances involving conflict of interest, policies regarding the amount of outside work for pay and safeguards surrounding use of institutional resources and facilities for their intended purposes are required. The relationship of full-time faculty serving as adjunct faculty or program advisers and using the learning resources and facilities of their full-time employer for programs of study offered by other institutions (accredited or unaccredited) should conform to their institution's policies and standards on these matters.

5. The conditions and circumstances of subcontracts with adjunct faculty in the community, with museums, art institutes, libraries, government agencies, foreign study institutions, and other diverse learning facilities should be made explicit and should be in conformity with the policies and standards of the institutions on such matters. They should be accompanied by a description of the means to be used for documenting and evaluating the work done by the student in reference to the objectives of the programs of study.

6. The conditions and circumstances of subcontracts by unaccredited institutions with accredited institutions for use by students of their learning resources, facilities, and degree-granting prerogatives should be made explicit. They should also be in conformity with the usual institutional policies and procedures safeguarding their intended use, and with the guidelines on "Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations."

   The concern here is both with the placement of responsibility, the use and availability of resources, and the relation between student charges, services rendered, and benefits acquired.

# JOINT STATEMENT

on

# TRANSFER AND AWARD OF ACADEMIC CREDIT

(Adopted June, 1981)

This statement is directed to institutions of postsecondary education and others concerned with the transfer of academic credit among institutions and award of academic credit for extra-institutional learning. Basic to this statement is the principle that each institution is responsible for determining its own policies and practices with regard to the transfer and award of credit. Institutions are encouraged to review their policies and practices periodically to assure that they accomplish the institution's objectives and that they function in a manner that is fair and equitable to students. Any statements, this one or others referred to, should be used as guides, not as substitutes, for institutional policies and practices.

Transfer of credit is a concept that now involves transfer between dissimilar institutions and curricula and recognition of extra-institutional learning, as well as transfer between institutions and curricula of similar characteristics. As their personal circumstances and educational objectives change, students seek to have their learning, wherever and however attained, recognized by institutions where they enroll for further study. It is important for reasons of social equity and educational effectiveness, as well as the wise use of resources, for all institutions to develop reasonable and definitive policies and procedures for acceptance of transfer credit. Such policies and procedures should provide maximum consideration for the individual student who has changed institutions or objectives. It is the receiving institution's responsibility to provide reasonable and definitive policies and procedures for determining a student's knowledge in required subject areas. All institutions have a responsibility to furnish transcripts and other documents necessary for a receiving institution to judge the quality and quantity of the work. Institutions also have a responsibility to advise the students that the work reflected on the transcript may or may not be accepted by a receiving institution.

## Inter-institutional Transfer of Credit

Transfer of credit from one institution to another involves at least three considerations:

(1) the educational quality of the institution from which the student transfers;

(2) the comparability of the nature, content, and level of credit earned to that offered by the receiving institution; and

(3) the appropriateness and applicability of the credit earned to the programs offered by the receiving institution, in light of the student's educational goals.

Accredited Institutions

Accreditation speaks primarily to the first of these considerations, serving as the basic indicator that an institution meets certain minimum standards. Users of accreditation are urged to give careful attention to the acccreditation conferred by accrediting bodies recognized by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA). COPA has a formal process of recognition which requires that any accrediting body so recognized must meet the same standards. Under these standards, COPA has recognized a number of accrediting bodies, including:

(1) regional accrediting commissions (which historically accredited the more traditional colleges and universities but which now accredit proprietary, vocational-technical, and single-purpose institutions as well);

(2) national accrediting bodies that accredit various kinds of specialized institutions; and

(3) certain professional organizations that accredit free-standing professional schools, in addition to programs within multi-purpose institutions. (COPA annually publishes a list of recognized accrediting bodies, as well as a directory of institutions accredited by these organizations.)

Although accrediting agencies vary in the ways they are organized and in their statements of scope and mission, all accrediting bodies that meet COPA's standards for recognition function to assure that the institutions or programs they accredit have met generally accepted minimum standards for accreditation.

Accreditation affords reason for confidence in an institution's or a program's purposes, in the appropriateness of its resources and plans for carrying out these purposes, and in its effectiveness in accomplishing its goals, insofar as these things can be judged. Accreditation speaks to the probability but does not guarantee, that students have met acceptable standards of educational accomplishment.

Comparability and Applicability

Comparability of the nature, content, and level of transfer credit and the appropriateness and applicability of the credit earned to programs offered by the receiving institution are as important in the evaluation process as the accreditation status of the institution at which the transfer credit was awarded. Since accreditation does not address these questions, this information must be obtained from catalogues and other materials and from direct contact between knowledgeable and experienced faculty and staff at both the receiving and sending institutions. When such considerations as comparability and appropriateness of credit are satisfied, however, the receiving institution should have reasonable confidence that students from accredited institutions are qualified to undertake the receiving institution's educational program.

Admissions and Degree Purposes

At some institutions there may be differences between the acceptance of credit for admission purposes and the applicability of credit for degree purposes. A receiving institution may accept previous work, place a credit value on it, and enter it on the transcript. However, that previous work, because of its nature and not its inherent quality, may be determined to have no applicability to a specific degree to be pursued by the student.

Institutions have a responsibility to make this distinction, and its implications, clear to students before they decide to enroll. This should be a matter of full disclosure, with the best interests of the student in mind. Institutions also should make every reasonable effort to reduce the gap between credits accepted and credits applied toward an educational credential.

Unaccredited Institutions

Institutions of postsecondary education that are not accredited by COPA-recognized accrediting bodies may lack that status for reasons unrelated to questions of quality. Such institutions, however, cannot provide a reliable, third-party assurance that they meet or exceed minimum standards. That being the case, students transferring from such institutions may encounter special problems in gaining acceptance and transferring credits to accredited institutions. Institutions admitting students from unaccredited institutions should take special steps to validate credits previously earned.

Foreign Institutions

In most cases, foreign institutions are chartered and authorized by their national governments, usually through a ministry of education. Although this provides for a standardization within a country, it does not produce useful information about comparability from one country to another. No other nation has a system comparable to voluntary accreditation. The Division of Higher Education of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) is engaged in a project to develop international compacts for the acceptance of educational credentials. At the operational level, four organizations -- the Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE), the National Council on the Evaluation of Foreign Student Credentials (CEC), the National Association for Foreign Student Admissions (NAFA), and the National Liaison Committee on Foreign Student Admissions (NLC) -- often can assist institutions by distributing general guidelines on admission and placement of foreign students. Equivalency or placement recommendations are to be evaluated in terms of the programs and policies of the individual receiving institution.

Validation of Extra-institutional and Experiential Learning for Transfer Purposes*

Transfer-of-credit policies should encompass educational accomplishment attained in extra-institutional settings as well as at accredited

* See ACCJC Policy, "Credit for Prior Experiential Learning in Undergraduate Programs."

postsecondary institutions. In deciding on the award of credit for extra-institutional learning, institutions will find the services of the American Council on Education's Office of Educational Credit helpful. One of the Office's functions is to operate and foster programs to determine credit equivalencies for various modes of extra-institutional learning. The Office maintains evaluation programs for formally structured courses offered by the military, and civilian noncollegiate sponsors such as business, corporations, government agencies, and labor unions. Evaluation services are also available for examination programs, for occupations with validated job proficiency evaluation systems, and for correspondence courses offered by schools accredited by the National Home Study Council. The results are published in a Guide series. Another resource is the General Education Development (GED) Testing Program, which provides a means for assessing high school equivalency.

For learning that has not been validated through the ACE formal credit recommendation process or through credit-by-examination programs, institutions are urged to explore the Council for Advancement of Experiential Learning (CAEL) procedures and processes. Pertinent CAEL publications designed for this purpose are also listed.

## Uses of this Statement

This statement has been endorsed by the three national associations most concerned with practices in the area of transfer and award of credit -- the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, the American Council on Education/Commission on Educational Credit, and the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.

Institutions are encouraged to use this statement as a basis for discussions in developing or reviewing institutional policies with regard to transfer. If the statement reflects an institution's policies, that institution might want to use this publication to inform faculty, staff, and students.

It is recommended that accrediting bodies reflect the essential precepts of this statement in their criteria.

Approved by the COPA Board
October 10, 1978

Approved by the American Council on Education/Commission on Educational Credit
December 5, 1978

Approved by the Executive Committee, American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers
November 21, 1978

/pln

## CREDIT FOR PRIOR EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING IN UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS
(Adopted June, 1980)

The Commission recognizes that undergraduate learning takes place in a variety of ways and settings and covers a broad spectrum of ages and experiences. It further recognizes that college level learning, judged by recognized academic criteria, but based on experiences other than those that occur in an academic setting, may be educationally creditable. Appropriate past learning from specific experiences can be used to undergird or supplement present and future learning beyond the secondary school, provided that such learning is relevant to the goals of the student's education and compatible with the purposes and stated objectives of the institution and its specific programs and curricula.

Evaluation of prior experiential learning has not been consistent either in procedures or in methods of reporting. The institution needs to have a well-defined philosophy regarding the awarding of credit, a clear statement of evaluation procedures, and a definitive plan to evaluate the amount of academic credit to be awarded. It is incumbent upon the chief executive of the institution to review at regular intervals these policies and procedures. In developing and publishing its guidelines and procedures, it is suggested that institutions follow the principles of good practice in assessing experiential learning represented by the Council for the Advancement of Experiential Learning (CAEL).*

The Commission recognizes the awarding of credit for prior learning, that is, credit that has preceded the application for it, provided that:

1. The official publication of the institution includes a statement providing for the award of credit for experiential learning. This statement should include the objectives, policies, procedures, and basis for the award of credit.

2. The student seeking credit for prior experiential learning is matriculated at the institution expected to grant credit. Credit to be awarded must be relevant to the student's approved academic program.

3. The student provides documentation of creditable prior experiential learning. Regular faculty with professional qualifications in the appropriate academic area must provide assessment measurement for competency level and evaluation for amount of credit to be awarded. The documentation provided by the student (often designated as a portfolio) may be used only as a source of information in the evaluation process and not as final evidence that evaluation has been completed. The portfolio facilitates assessment rather than justifying the award of credit. Both the documentation and the evaluation of it must be placed in the student's permanent record file.

* Willingham, Warren W., Principles of Good Practice in Assessing Experiential Learning, CAEL, American City Building, Suite 403, Columbia, MD 21044, 1977.

4. A panel of full-time faculty holding regular appointments reviews and gives final approval to the documentation for, and the amount of, credit awarded for prior experiential learning. For highly specialized instructional fields, the panel may include both full-time staff and/or an appropriate number of specialists.

5. Before credit for prior experiential learning becomes a part of the student's permanent record, the student completes at the credit-granting institution a sufficient number of units to establish evidence of a satisfactory learning pattern.

6. Only college level learning is creditable, consistent with the academic standards of the institution.

7. Fees charged have a reasonable relationship to the institution's investment of time and resources and are realistically related to the cost of the program. Adequate precautions should be provided to ensure that the payment of fees does not influence the award of credit.

8. Courses or subjects for which credit for prior experiential learning is given are clearly indicated as such on the student's record and transcripts, and the institution is prepared, on request of another institution or agency, to furnish full documentation showing how such learning was evaluated and the basis on which such credit was awarded.

Definition of terms:

Learning: The acquisition of knowledge, appreciation, understanding or skills, which are appropriate to postsecondary education and to degree requirements of institutions of postsecondary education.

Demonstrable: Learning must be demonstrable in the sense that a student can present evidence of learning. The kinds of evidence are numerous and might include written or oral exams, tapes, projects, demonstrations, and performances in a form which permits analysis. The institution has a responsibility to make clear to the student and the accrediting agency the means by which competencies can be acceptably demonstrated.

Portfolio: Information prepared by the student to be used as evidence in the evaluation process to determine any credit which might be awarded for prior experiential learning.

Credit: The translation of prior learning experiences into Carnegie Unit equivalencies.

## NONDISCRIMINATION
(Adopted October, 1973)

Educational institutions should contain within their environment the essence of the qualities they endeavor to impart, including the essential of nondiscrimination. They have a responsibility to develop selection and promotion standards and procedures based on principles which consider qualities, aptitudes, or talents simply as they pertain to the requirements of the position, with due regard for affirmative action. Institutions are expected to review their policies and procedures regularly to determine their validity in keeping with these principles.

## ACCREDITATION AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

(Adopted January, 1982)

The decision to enter into a collective bargaining agreement is primarily institutional, governed by state laws for public institutions and federal laws for private institutions. Accrediting commissions take no position, pro or con, on these decisions.

Regional accreditation evaluates the effectiveness of an institution in achieving its stated purposes. Its primary concern is with the total institution. Whenever institutional policies and procedures are modified by collective bargaining agreements, such modification should not contravene the requirements of accreditation standards, nor should negotiations unduly disrupt the educational processes of the institution.

Within this context, accreditation agencies believe that the self-study, the evaluation team, and those responsible for accreditation decisions must consider the impact of collective bargaining on the quality and effectiveness of the institution. To help achieve this result, the following principles are presented for adherence:

1) Collective bargaining processes should not impede self-study participation by administrators, faculty, and support staff, as well as appropriate involvement of trustees and students.

2) The self-study committee and the evaluation team should assess the impact of collective bargaining on the quality and effectiveness of the institution.

3) Evaluation teams should use care in composing recommendations which may be used by either party to influence the bargaining process. In writing the evaluation report, teams should avoid the use of language that is inflamatory or easily distorted for partisan purposes.

4) Institutional representatives are reminded that team recommendations must be considered, but no one of them is a mandate or an arbitrary standard.

5) Institutions should strive to clarify the respective roles of faculty senates and faculty bargaining units.

6) Bargaining agreements should be part of the document collection for team visits.

If an institution believes that the collective bargaining climate will impair an effective self-study or team visit, the chief executive officer is invited to confer with the Commission Executive Director. In unusual circumstances, the Commission will consider a request to defer either or both processes until conditions are more favorable.

## POSTSECONDARY EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS CONDUCTED BY ACCREDITED OR CANDIDATE INSTITUTIONS ON MILITARY BASES

(Adopted October, 1973, Revised January, 1978)

The regional accrediting commissions are pleased to note that the military services are very much aware of the critical need for well-educated manpower, and fully endorse the development of educational programs on military bases designed to provide for the personal and professional growth of personnel through educational courses and programs in cooperation with accredited and candidate postsecondary institutions.

Institutions are encouraged to cooperate with the military services in designing appropriate courses and programs for both military personnel and also such military-related or civilian personnel as it may be considered feasible to accept. In establishing courses or programs, institutions should recognize that special considerations frequently must be made; e.g., courses designed for the undergraduate on a college campus or for professional preparation in an academic discipline may not adequately meet the needs or capitalize on the experience of military personnel. The usual fixed requirements of residence and traditional methods of accumulating credits may fail to allow for the unique circumstances of the military person. Hence, it is the commissions' view that an institution offering such courses, while holding to the basic quality essential to good educational programs, should feel free to adapt methods, policies, and procedures to the regimen and conditions under which the military student must perform his duties and pursue his studies.

Providing educational opportunities for interested personnel on military bases is a dual responsibility. Certain guides and requisites can be established which may provide both incentive and direction for officers of the military in positions of responsibility on base. Likewise there are helpful guides that might provide direction for those from the college campus responsible for such services. Successful programs in these situations will not be realized unless there is mutual understanding, a sharing of responsibilities, and a marshaling of resources essential for such offerings.

### Responsibilities of Institutions

1. Programs offered should relate to the purposes and adhere to the educational standards of the institution.

   Provisions should be made for students to work toward completion of appropriate programs offered by the institution. Without compromising the principle that quality will be equivalent to that on campus, course offerings might be more flexible or non-traditional than those required of the campus student. Thus the educational goal of the military base student might be given special consideration within the general graduation requirements

of the institution without depreciation of standards. Although institutions should refrain from offering work unrelated to either their mission or resources, they may provide service or cultural courses without credit when such experiences can be of personal worth or upgrade competencies required of the military person.

2. In organizing and administering base programs, institutions should take into consideration the uniqueness of military situations.

   The staff member assigned the responsibility of representing an institution in its military base effort must recognize the unique demands of the situation. He must realize that the first demand upon the base personnel is a military commitment, and arrangements for such individuals must fit into this demand. Although organization and administration practices need not duplicate or conform to campus routines, appropriate standards should be maintained.

3. Student personnel policies and services should be such as to facilitate the success of a program on a military base.

   Admission requirements should reflect the demands of postsecondary level studies and degree requirements, and at the same time take into consideration the student's background in terms of equivalencies. Registration procedures should be accommodated to the conditions under which the military work, and counseling services provided by relevantly prepared and experienced individuals. Special provisions should be made for program advising so students may know requirements as well as make adjustments in terms of their own educational goals. Adjustments may need to be made in residence requirements and/or the substitution of courses for transfer credit or degree purposes. Provision should be made for the possibility of advanced placement or credit by examination or evaluation.

4. Both faculty and instruction should be of recognized quality.

   For military base education programs, the faculty are drawn from the cooperating institution, the military base staff, and from other institutions. Qualified specialists without institutional affiliation may also be employed. Instructors must be professionally competent in regard to specific preparation and recency of involvement in the field. When participating institutions employ faculty from other institutions on a part-time basis, it is recommended that they do so with permission from the faculty members' full-time employer; this will avoid the danger of excessive overloads.

   The quality of instruction should be comparable to that on campus, with the same degree of concern for teaching tools and learning resources. Necessary library materials must be available or

accessible. Special provisions may be needed for the completion of course work when students are called from base. Regardless of departures from campus practice, grades should not be given until students meet all course requirements.

5. Integrity among institutions offering programs on a single base is essential.

   Institutions placed in competition with each other in making bids to provide services must guard against the erosion of quality of instruction. To avoid negative aspects of competition, several participating institutionson a base should consult among themselves and with the military education services officer. In all deliberations and negotiations, it is expected that a high degree of integrity will be maintained.

6. Cooperation among institutions is essential whenever an institution from outside the area is invited to or seeks to offer educational programs on a base located within the area of another institution.

   Before bidding or contracting to offer such programs, the outside institution should consult with the institution within whose area the base is located to determine whether the home institution is prepared to offer the desired program. If the home institution is not prepared to offer the service, or is not interested in doing so, it should so indicate to the outside institution in writing, with appropriate provisions for periodic review of the agreement.

Guides and Obligations of the Military

1. The military should not hesitate to initiate negotiations for the purpose of providing educational programs on base.

   When postsecondary educational opportunities are not being provided and when personnel on base express an interest in them, military officials should initiate the action necessary for securing such programs. The leadership should first assess and identify the types of programs and services desired before approaching an institution. It is always helpful to know at the outset precisely what is desired, the approximate number of students that are likely to be involved, and the resources which the base might be able to provide. Education officers should be open in making needs known to interested institutions and in inviting proposals for programs. Memoranda of understanding or contracts should be negotiated directly between military bases and participating institutions. Where possible, it is recommended that such memoranda of understanding or contracts run for more than one year to assure program stability. Perhaps bases could work toward standardization of contracts and thus insure greater consistency in the services provided by an institution.

2. A joint meeting of both institution and base leadership should occur early.

After the educational needs of base personnel are determined there should be a joint exploration and planning session with base and institution representatives. Such a meeting should define the needs, identify essential resources, describe the general nature of programs desired, and define the specific responsibilities of all parties. Written agreements should be reached prior to initiation of the program to guide both the base and the participating institution in carrying out the program.

3. The military will have responsibility for supplying certain essential resources.

   In addition to identifying programs desired, the number of persons involved, and the costs, the military should expect to provide certain essentials for such programs on base:

   a. Suitable and adequate classrooms.
   b. Space and facilities for a library or learning center.
   c. Adequate learning resources to support the program.
   d. Laboratory space and essential equipment for courses requiring laboratory experiments.
   e. Other equipment and supplies (e.g., typewriters, business machines, etc.) essential to the courses offered.

   It is the responsibility of the educational institution to notify the military base of additional or extraordinary needs sufficiently in advance to make it possible for the base to fulfill the request.

   The military in most instances will be expected to provide certain initial funds for starting the service.

4. The military must give full support and backing to the program once it is initiated.

   No program will succeed without the continuing support of the post commander, his staff, and the highest officials of the respective service branch. A postsecondary program will also need the attention of an educational officer who is a qualified educator and is given time and staff to manage and evaluate the program and provide essential academic advisement. The educational officer will need the full support of all base officials. The success of such programs is highly dependent upon the experience, leadership, and resourcefulness of such an individual.

5. There is need for greater uniformity of policy and practice among the various branches of the military.

   It has been noted that differences exist in both policy and practice between various branches of the service. The commissions urge that steps be taken toward the following:

   a. Greater commonality in administrative organization of educational programs throughout the services.

b. More common or comparable scales of tuition support.
c. More common agreement on what constitutes adequate classroom space and equipment.

Greater uniformity of commitment on the part of the various branches could do much to increase comparability of programs and services among military bases, and would improve efficiency and reduce the administrative burden on institutions providing educational programs to more than one base.

6. On bases where non-military personnel are permitted to take courses, it is understood that the first responsibility in terms of space and instructional services is to the military student. However, the inclusion of community people on a space-available and self-paid basis may be beneficial to all parties concerned and is encouraged.

Evaluation of Educational Programs on Military Bases

1. Educational programs conducted by accredited or candidate postsecondary institutions on a military base should be evaluated by the appropriate regional accrediting commission in conjunction with an institutional evaluation.

Although informal evaluations may be made by military education staff, it is not appropriate for the military to engage in formally evaluating the programs of an accredited postsecondary institution. It is recommended, however, that appropriate military educational personnel confer with the institution in doing the relevant part of its self-study. An evaluation team may wish to confer with the military regarding the support, resources, and effectiveness of a given program.

2. If an accredited institution offers educational programs on a military base within another accrediting region, the evaluation should be conducted jointly by the affected commissions with primary responsibility vested in the parent commission. In the case of overseas programs conducted outside the United States or its possessions, the evaluation should be conducted by the appropriate regional commission.

3. Those responsible for postsecondary military base programs will be cognizant of and generally expected to meet the appropriate military, state, and regional accrediting commission guidelines for operation of the programs.

Consortia Arrangements

Where two or more institutions are joined together in consortia to provide educational programs on military bases certain common administrative arrangements and educational policies need to be agreed upon. This can be handled by a consortium board with appropriate representation from each of the participating institutions and the military. Such matters as calendar, admissions, course and degree requirements, transfer of credits, and tuition should be developed.

From the outset the appropriate regional accrediting commission should be notified of and involved in the development of the consortia. Evaluation of the consortia educational program will be in conjunction with the evaluation and accreditation process with each participating institution. Consortia arrangements will not be independently evaluated for separate accredited status.

## CONTRACTUAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH NON-REGIONALLY ACCREDITED ORGANIZATIONS

(Adopted March, 1973)

No postsecondary educational institution accredited by a regional institutional accrediting commission can lend the prestige or authority of its accreditation to authenticate courses or programs offered under contract with organizations not so accredited unless it demonstrates adherence to the following principles:

1. The primary purpose of offering such a course or program is educational. (Although the primary purpose of the offering must be educational, what ancillary purposes also provide the foundation for the program or course such as auxiliary services, anticipated income, and public relations?)

2. Any course offered must be consistent with the institution's educational purpose and objectives as they were at the time of the last evaluation. If the institution alters its purpose and objectives, the regional commission must be notified and the policy on substantive change applied. (How does the institution define the specific relationship between the primary and ancillary purposes and the contracted service and how does it demonstrate its capability to attain these purposes?)

3. Courses to be offered and the value and level of their credit must be determined in accordance with established institutional procedures, and under the usual mechanisms of review. (What evidence exists that established institutional procedures have been followed?)

4. Courses offered for credit must remain under the sole and direct control of the sponsoring accredited institution, which exercises ultimate and continuing responsibility for the performance of these functions as reflected in the contract, with provisions to assure that conduct of the courses meets the standards of its regular programs as disclosed fully in the institution's publications, especially as these pertain to:

   a. Recruitment and counseling of students.
   b. Admission of students to courses and/or to the sponsoring institution where credit programs are pursued.
   c. Instructions in the courses.
   d. Evaluation of student progress.
   e. Record keeping.
   f. Tuition and/or fees charged, receipt and disbursement of funds, and refund policy.
   g. Appointment and validation of credentials of faculty teaching the course.
   h. Nature and location of courses.
   i. Instructional resources, such as the library.

Additional data needed would include course outlines, syllabi, copies of exams, records of students, and evidence of equivalencies with established programs.

In establishing contractual arrangements with non-regionally accredited organizations, institutions are expected to utilize the following guidelines. The not-for-profit institution should establish that its tax-exempt status, as governed by state or federal regulations, will not be affected by such contractual arrangements with a for-profit organization.

The Contract

1. Should be executed only by duly designated officers of the institution and their counterparts in the contracting organization. While other faculty and administrative representatives will undoubtedly be involved in the contract negotiations, care should be taken to avoid implied or apparent power to execute the contract by unauthorized personnel.

2. Should establish a definite understanding between the institution and contractor regarding the work to be performed, the period of the agreement, and the conditions under which any possible renewal or renegotiation of the contract would take place.

3. Should clearly vest the ultimate responsibility for the performance of the necessary control functions for the educational offering with the accredited institution granting credit for the offering. Such performance responsibility by the credit granting institution would minimally consist of adequate provisions for review and approval of work performed in each functional area by the contractor.

4. Should clearly establish the responsibilities of the institution and contractor regarding:

   a. Indirect costs
   b. Approval of salaries
   c. Equipment
   d. Subcontracts and travel
   e. Property ownership and accountability
   f. Inventions and patents
   g. Publications and copyrights
   h. Accounting records and audits
   i. Security
   j. Termination costs
   k. Tuition refund
   l. Student records
   m. Faculty facilities
   n. Safety regulations
   o. Insurance coverage

Enrollment Agreement

1. The enrollment agreement should clearly outline the obligations of both the institution and the student, and a copy of the enrollment agreement should be furnished to the student before any payment is made.

2. The institution should determine that each applicant is fully informed as to the nature of the obligation he is entering into and as to his responsibilities and his rights under the enrollment agreement before he signs it.

3. No enrollment agreement should be binding until it has been accepted by the authorities of the institution vested with this responsibility.

Tuition Policies

1. Rates

   a. The total tuition for any specific given course should be the same for all persons at any given time. Group training contracts showing lower individual rates may be negotiated with business, industrial, or governmental agencies.

   b. Tuition charges in courses should be bona fide, effective on specific dates, and applicable to all who enroll thereafter or are presently in school, provided the enrollment agreement so stipulates.

   c. All extra charges and costs incidental to training should be revealed to the prospective student before he is enrolled.

   d. The institution should show that the total tuition charges for each of its courses is reasonable in the light of the service to be rendered, the equipment to be furnished, and its operating costs.

2. Refunds and Cancellations

   a. The institution should have a fair and equitable tuition refund and cancellation policy.

   b. The institution should publish its tuition refund and cancellation policy in its catalog or other appropriate literature.

3. Collection Practices

   a. Methods used by an institution in requesting or demanding payment should follow sound ethical business practices.

   b. If promissory notes or contracts for tuition are sold or discounted to third parties by the institution, enrollees or their financial sponsors should be aware of this action.

Student Recruitment

1. Advertising and Promotional Literature

   a. All advertisements and promotional literature used should be truthful and avoid leaving any false, misleading, or exaggerated

impressions with respect to the school, its personnel, its courses and services, or the occupational opportunities for its graduates.

b. All advertising and promotional literature used should clearly indicate that education, and not employment, is being offered.

c. All advertising and promotional literature should include the correct name of the school. So-called "blind" advertisements are considered misleading and unethical.

2. Field Agents

a. An institution is responsible to its current and prospective students for the representations made by its field representatives (including agencies and other authorized persons or firms soliciting students), and therefore should select each of them with the utmost care, provide them with adequate training, and arrange for proper supervision of their work.

b. It is the responsibility of an institution to conform to the laws and regulations of each of the states in which it operates or solicits students, and in particular to see that each of its field representatives working in any such state is properly licensed or registered as required by the laws of the state.

c. If field representatives are authorized to prepare and/or run advertising, or to use promotional materials, the institution should accept full responsibility for the materials used and should approve any such in advance of their use.

d. When field representatives are authorized to collect money from an applicant for enrollment, they should leave with the applicant a receipt for the money collected and a copy of the enrollment agreement.

e. No field representative should use any title, such as "counselor," "advisor," or "registrar," that tends to indicate that his duties and responsibilities are other than they actually are.

f. No field agent should violate orally any of the standards applicable to advertising and promotional material.

## ACCREDITATION OF UNITED STATES INSTITUTIONS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

(Adopted October, 1968)

Nonprofit institutions of higher education established by and intended primarily to serve United States nationals outside the United States and its territories will be considered by ACCJC only if they are chartered or approved in states which are part of the Western Association area (California and Hawaii).

Institutions so accredited will be accorded the rights and privileges of membership in the regional association. Their names will appear on the national list of accredited institutions published by COPA.

## COLLEGIATE ATHLETICS
(Adopted January, 1982)

The primary concern of an educational institution is its educational effectiveness. An evaluation of that effectiveness therefore rests upon the contribution of each of its programs toward achieving the educational objectives of the institution as a whole.

Consequently the evaluation of collegiate athletics begins with the definition of the program's objectives. They need to be published, clearly understood, and faithfully observed as a guide for action. Obviously they must be consonant with the aims of the institution itself and with the fundamental purposes of higher education. Their emphasis should be upon the welfare of the participants and of as many of the other students as possible.

The statement of objectives should represent the concerted view of the faculty, administration, and trustees, and therefore should be prepared and approved cooperatively by all components. The objectives need to be reviewed from time to time to ensure that they represent the current position of the institution and sound educational policy, and that everyone concerned understands and is governed by them.

Sports and athletics of all kinds - intercollegiate, intramural, and recreational - are and will continue to be as rooted in our educational institutions as they are in American society. Thus, they deserve attention by the accrediting process as essential elements related to the quality and integrity of higher education. The issue is not whether there should be athletics programs, but rather that they be conducted in a manner consistent with an institution's published objectives and educational mission.

Intercollegiate programs should not be favored to the detriment of appropriate intramural and recreational athletics programs on a campus.

### Organization

While organizational details such as status of coaches and athletic directors will vary with local conditions, ultimate responsibility for all programs rests with the chief executive officer of the institution and the governing board. In the institutional governance structure, the committee overseeing athletic programs should involve representatives of appropriate constituencies including faculty, students, and administrators.

### Finance

All expenditures for and income from athletics, from whatever source, and the administration of scholarships, grants-in-aid, loans, and student employment, should be fully controlled by the institution and be included in its regular budgeting, accounting, and auditing procedures.

## PART VII - APPENDIX

### A. ACCREDITATION AGENCIES AND RELATED ORGANIZATIONS

#### 1. Western Association of Schools and Colleges*

The Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) is one of six regional accrediting associations that cover the United States, whose purpose is continual improvement of education and cooperation among educational institutions and agencies.

WASC was formed July 1, 1962, for the purpose of evaluation and accreditation of schools, colleges, and universities in California, Hawaii, and Pacific island areas.

WASC functions through a Board of Directors and three accrediting commissions. The Board of Directors consists of nine members, three of whom are elected by each of the WASC commissions. The Board annually elects one of its members to be Chairman of the Board and President of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. It also elects a Secretary-Treasurer, who is usually the executive director of one of the three accrediting commissions.

The Board of Directors and the Secretary-Treasurer are responsible for the annual publication of the WASC Directory, which lists WASC-accredited and candidate institutions.

Each commission develops its own standards, procedures and fiscal policies, under the authority of and subject to the approval of the WASC Board of Directors.

Those institutions which have been evaluated by Commissions and have received approval are accredited by WASC. Any such accreditation shall cease whenever an institution is dropped from the accredited list of the Association, or fails to pay its annual fees, or requests in writing that its accreditation be terminated.

---

* For the WASC Constitution and list of candidate and accredited institutions, see the official WASC Directory.

The three accrediting commissions of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges are:

a. Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities

Dr. Kay J. Andersen is the Executive Director, and the Commission maintains an office on the campus of Mills College. The mailing address is Box 9990, Oakland, California 94613. The telephone number is (415) 632-5000.

The Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities consists of members named by the Western College Association, one from each of the other two WASC accrediting commissions, representatives selected from the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges, and the general public. The President of the Western College Association is an ex officio member.

b. Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

Dr. Robert E. Swenson is the Executive Director, and the Commission office is located at 9053 Soquel Drive, Aptos, California 95003. The mailing address is Post Office Box 70. The telephone number is (408) 688-7575.

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) consists of members named by the California Community and Junior College Association, the other two WASC commissions, the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, the President of the University of Hawaii, the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges, a representative of the non-public institutions, and three members representing the public interest.

c. Accrediting Commission for Schools

Dr. Lyle Siverson is the Executive Director. The Commission office is at 1614 Rollins Road, Burlingame, California 94010. The telephone number is (415) 697-7711.

Members of the Accrediting Commission for Schools are named by the Association of California School Administrators, the California Department of Education, the Hawaii Department of Education, the other two WASC accrediting commissions, the California School Boards Association, and the faculty organizations. Commission membership also includes representatives of non-public school groups.

2. Other Regional Commissions in the United States

Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Higher Education, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104. Telephone (215) 662-5600. Executive Director, Robert Kirkwood.

New England Association of Schools and Colleges, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, William J. MacLeod, Director of Evaluation; Commission on Vocational, Technical, Career Institutions, Daniel S. Maloney, Director of Evaluation; 131 Middlesex Turnpike, Burlington, Massachusetts 01803. Telephone (617) 272-6450.

North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, 1221 University Avenue, Boulder, Colorado 80302, telephone (800) 525-0840; and 830 Davis Street, Evanston, Illinois 60201, telephone (800) 323-6528; Director, Thurston E. Manning.

Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges, Commission on Colleges, 3700-B University Way N.E., Seattle, Washington 98105. Telephone (206) 543-0195. Executive Director, James F. Bemis.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 795 Peachtree Street N.E., Atlanta, Georgia 30308. Gordon W. Sweet, Executive Secretary, Commission on Colleges; B. E. Childers, Executive Secretary, Commission on Occupational Education Institutions. Telephone (404) 875-8011.

3. The Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA)

COPA is a non-governmental organization intended to foster and facilitate the role of all recognized postsecondary accrediting agencies in promoting and ensuring the quality and diversity of American postsecondary education. The accrediting agencies, while established and supported by their institutions, are intended to serve the broader interests of society as well. To achieve these ends, COPA recognizes, coordinates, and periodically reviews the work of its member accrediting agencies, determines the appropriateness of existing or proposed accrediting activities and performs other related functions in accord with its bylaws.

The endorsement and certification of regional accrediting by COPA reflects the long-standing reciprocity among the regional associations in recognition of accredited status. Candidacy or accreditation of an institution by one regional agency has long been accepted and respected in the other regions as evidence that the institution's performance in the accomplishment of its purposes is satisfactory. The publication of a national list of candidate and accredited institutions by COPA places general institutional accreditation in a national as well as a regional context.

COPA's activities are managed by its board, which is composed of public representatives and representatives from regional accrediting commissions of higher education, specialized postsecondary agencies and national education associations.

The President of COPA is Dr. Richard Millard, and the office is located at One Dupont Circle, Suite 760, Washington, D.C. 20036. Telephone (202) 452-1433.

4. Far West Council on Accreditation (FWCA)

Two of the regional accrediting associations -- Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges and Western Association of Schools and Colleges -- have formed the Far West Council on Accreditation.

The purpose of the Far West Council on Accreditation is to function as an articulating link between the three commissions of WASC and the two commissions of NWASC.

There have been cooperative efforts between the two associations including an exchange of members on evaluation teams and participation in other activities. The Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities and the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of WASC include persons from the Northwest Association as members of the commissions, and the Commission on Colleges of the Northwest Association has members from WASC.

REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES

B. GLOSSARY OF DEFINITIONS AND ACRONYMS

Academic Credit: Credit applicable toward a degree or certificate at the institution awarding it, accepting it on transfer, or acknowledging equivalency from learning experience adequately substantiated.

Accreditation: A voluntary process involving an association of schools and colleges to encourage high standards of education. Accreditation indicates that the accrediting commission judges that the institution, in a manner consistent with Commission standards, offers its students on a satisfactory level the educational opportunities set forth in its objectives, and is likely to continue to do so.

ACCJC: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges.

ACSCU: Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities.

Administration: Those personnel identified by title who have defined responsibilities for direction and supervising institutional functions.

Admission Policy: The rationale which determines the applicants who shall be admitted to an institution. Consideration is given to the role assigned to the institution by its governing body; the programs, resources, and facilities of the institution; and the qualifications and goals of the applicant.

AICPA: American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. Publishes the guide, "Audits of Colleges and Universities."

Appeal: An appeal from Commission decision to a panel in accordance with due process described in the Constitution and Bylaws of the Association (see Policy on "WASC Appeals Procedures," page 90).

Appropriate: Term used to indicate a judgmental matter, possibly debatable or subject to differences of educated opinion, i.e., student services appropriate to a particular clientele; depth of content appropriate to a particular level.

Calendar: The institution's scheduling arrangement for classes, i.e., quarter, semester, summer, intersessions, etc.

Candidate: Candidate for Accreditation is a status of preliminary affiliation with the Commission, initially awarded for two years, following a specified procedure for institutional self-study and on-site visitation. Candidacy is subject to renewal. Candidacy is not accreditation and does not assure eventual accreditation. It is an indication that the institution is progressing toward accreditation.

Catalog: The official bulletin or college publication stating admission and graduation requirements, majors, minors, current course offering, costs, faculty, and all other significant information necessary for an accurate understanding of the institution.

CCJCA: California Community and Junior College Association.

CEO: Chief executive officer of a district or system.

College: Generic term to denote any of the postsecondary educational institutions; in this Handbook it is used as a synonym for "institution."

Commission: The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges.

Complaint: In WASC terms, a written complaint to the Commission against an institution. See Policy on "Special Institutional Reviews and Consideration of Complaints," page 81.

COPA: The Council on Postsecondary Accreditation. A national organization representing institutional and specialized accrediting agencies and the general public.

Course: A single subject described in college catalog or bulletin.

Credit, Unit of: A quantification of student learning. One semester unit represents what a typical student might be expected to learn in one week (40-45 hours including class time and preparation) of full-time study. Thus a six-week summer session might, if full-time, equate to six units.

District Office: A central administrative and coordinating agency, responsible for the activities of two or more community colleges. (See also "System.")

Executive Director: The chief full-time officer of the Commission.

Faculty: Teaching and other professional personnel including librarians, counselors, and similar professional specialists in non-administrative positions.

Fifth-Year Review: A brief report with a limited visit for institutions on the ten-year review cycle. Not to be confused with comprehensive self-studies and team visits.

FRACHE: Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education. An organization of regional commissions, replaced in 1975 by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.

Level: Refers to placement of students at a certain level of college work, i.e., first two years or Associate degree.

Liaison Officer: The individual in an institution assigned to carry on most continuing relations with the Commission. See Policy on "Institutional Accreditation Liaison Officer," page 78.

Policy: A written statement approved by the Commission. See pages 67-112.

President: A generic term signifying the chief executive of an institution. Provost, director, etc., may be substituted.

Probation: A negative status assigned to an institution because of failure to comply with Commission standards or requirements. See Policy on "Negative Actions of the Commission," pages 84-85.

Program: A systematic, usually sequential, grouping of courses, forming a considerable part, or all, of the requirements for a degree or credential. May refer to the total educational offering of an institution.

Review: Upon request by an institution, reexamination by the Commission of a negative action taken by it.

Show Cause: A negative status including a specific date when candidacy or accreditation will be withdrawn if certain conditions are not met. See Policy on "Negative Actions of the Commission," pages 84-85.

Staff: All employed personnel (the inclusive term).

Substantive Change: See Policy, page 82.

Support Staff: Personnel in positions that do not require certification (in those states with certification laws). Usually includes office workers, fiscal specialists, maintenance personnel, technicians, and aides.

System: A central administrative and coordinating agency, responsible for the activities of a number of colleges, sometimes both senior colleges and community colleges.

Team (also "Visiting Team" or "Evaluation Team"): A group assigned to review an institution's self-study, to visit the institution for on-site validation of the self-study, and to report to the Commission its findings and recommendations in a written evaluation report.

WASC: Western Association of Schools and Colleges.

C. SUGGESTIONS FOR ORGANIZING A SELF-STUDY

1. Plan for at least a full academic year to organize and conduct the study.

2. Use a small steering committee with an active, interested chairman to plan the work, hold it in balance, suggest new approaches and arrange for editing the final report.

   The authority and office of the president are essential to keep maximum emphasis on the project and to see that the results are translated into action and/or long range plans.

3. Involve staff, governing board, and students in the evaluation and appraisal inherent in the self-study process.

4. Stress that an important feature of this kind of study is that it brings the institution into focus, emphasizes relationships among as well as performance within units, and encourages healthy cross-fertilization of ideas. Organize the study committees so that their work represents the entire institution and affords opportunity for widespread participation in the study.

5. Provide each study committee with specific instructions on tasks to be completed and with Commission documents for study (reproduce copies as needed). The ACCJC video tapes are available on request to explain the process.

6. Adopt a definite timetable, make it realistic, and insist on maintaining it.

   Plan backward. Set a publication date for the self-study report at least eight weeks before the evaluation team is due to arrive so that the report can be in the hands of the Commission and visitors forty-five days before the visit. Having determined the completion date, allow a month preceding that for final editing and duplicating. Then work back towards the beginning, allowing the necessary intervals for each stage.

   Remember in estimating time allowances what a major undertaking this is and how many people will be involved. It must deal with the separate phases of the institution's life, but it must go beyond them in its concern with their relationships, with the focusing or directing of the institution's total effort, with its overall educational impact as well as with the efficiency of each of its units.

7. Carry the results of the study through to action. Perhaps the steering committee can remain helpful in the post-evaluation state too, but clearly the president, the other administrators, and the faculty standing committees have continuing responsibilities.

D. ROLES OF SENATES AND BARGAINING UNITS

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges provided the following position statement on the respective roles of faculty senates and faculty bargaining units:

> The coming of collective bargaining has, in many instances, divided the role of the faculty into two components, that of the faculty as employees, represented by a collective bargaining agent, and that of faculty in the traditional academic role, represented through faculty senates or faculty councils. All constituents involved in institutional governance need to recognize and delineate these differing roles of faculty representative bodies.
>
> To the extent that the matter under consideration is one of wages, hours, working conditions, or for the general benefit of the faculty as employees, it is clearly in the province of the collective bargaining agent.
>
> To the extent that a matter involves academic and professional issues related to the development and furtherance of educational policy, including, but not limited to, academic standards, accreditation, articulation, credentialing, curriculum, staff development and student services, it is clearly within the province of academic senates or faculty councils. This, in no way, limits the consultation rights of bargaining agents where authorized by statute.

E. FORMS

CERTIFICATION OF THE INSTITUTIONAL SELF-STUDY REPORT

(To be Inserted in the Report)

Date _____

TO: ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES, WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

FROM: _____
Name of Institution

_____
Address

_____

This Institutional Self-Study Report is submitted for the purpose of assisting in the determination of the institution's accreditation status.

We certify that there was broad participation by the campus community, and we believe the Self-Study Report accurately reflects the nature and substance of this institution.

Signed _____
Name — Chief Administrative Officer

_____
Name — Chairman, Governing Board

_____
Name — Title — Representing

_____
Name — Title — Representing

_____
Name — Title — Representing

_____
Name — Title — Representing

_____
Name — Title — Representing

_____
Name — Title — Representing

CONFIDENTIAL RECOMMENDATION FORM

Name of institution evaluated _____

Date(s) of visit _____ Type of visit _____

The visiting team's confidential recommendation to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges is:

Candidacy

_____ Grant candidacy.

_____ Deny candidacy.

_____ Extend candidacy.

_____ Deny accreditation. Extend candidacy.

_____ Terminate candidacy.

Accreditation (Initial)

_____ Grant initial accreditation.

_____ Grant initial accreditation with a progress report in _____ years.

_____ Grant initial accreditation with a progress report and limited visit in _____ years.

_____ Deny accreditation.

Accreditation (Reaffirmation)

_____ Reaffirm accreditation.

_____ Reaffirm accreditation with a report in _____ years.

_____ Reaffirm accreditation with a report and limited visit in _____ years.

_____ Issue a warning to correct deficiencies by _____ (Date).

_____ Probation through _____ (Date).

_____ Show cause through _____ (Date).

_____ Terminate accreditation.

Signed _____ (Chairman)

Note: Attach a sheet which sets forth the major considerations which caused the team to make the above recommendation. Be sure that the items listed are included in, and are consistent with, the team report. If there is an unresolved minority opinion, attach a supplementary sheet.

Team Signatures: Use reverse side.

VERIFICATION OF RECOMMENDATION

This form should be completed by the chairperson and signed by each member of the team before leaving the institution.

| NAME OF TEAM MEMBER | INSTITUTION | SIGNATURE |
| --- | --- | --- |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

## 1982-83 FEE SCHEDULE

| TYPE FEE | 1982-83 |
|---|---|
| **ANNUAL** (all candidate and accredited institutions) | |
| **Enrollment** (FTE or ADA[1]) | |
| 0 - 999 | $ 600 |
| 1000 - 1999 | 800 |
| 2000 - 4999 | 1,000 |
| 5000 - 9999 | 1,200 |
| 10,000 - over | 1,400 |
| ELIGIBILITY REVIEW CHARGE | |
| A charge for the review of application materials to determine eligibility for candidate status. | 100 |
| EVALUATION SERVICE CHARGE[2] (Candidacy) | 1,100 |
| EVALUATION SERVICE CHARGE[2] (Initial Accreditation or Reaffirmation with Comprehensive Visit - California Institutions) | |
| **Enrollment** (FTE or ADA[1]) | |
| 0 - 1999 | 2,400 |
| 2000 - 9999 | 3,000 |
| 10,000 - over | 3,600 |
| Under 1000 (Special Purpose Institution[3]) | 1,200 |
| EVALUATION SERVICE CHARGE[2] (5th Year Options - California Institutions) | 1,200 |
| SYSTEM or DISTRICT EVALUATIONS | |
| Actual expenses of the team visit plus an amount to cover the special costs to the ACCJC office (to be set based on approved district or system plan). | |
| SPECIAL VISITS | |
| Actual team expenses. | |

Notes

1) ADA - Average Daily Attendance
   FTE - Full-time Equivalent
2) Hawaii institutions pay double the standard charge because of travel costs. Other Pacific area institutions pay actual team expenses associated with the visit.
3) Special purpose institutions under 1000 FTE with programs in not more than three fields.

VIII. INDEX

Academic Freedom . . . . . 17-18
Academic Records . . . . . 20
Academic Senate . . . . . 35, 122
Accreditation, Achieving and Maintaining . . . . . 1-5
Accreditation, Conditions for Eligibility . . . . . 1-2
Accreditation, Outside United States . . . . . 112
Accreditation, Regional . . . . . 113-115
Accreditation and Nontraditional Study. . . . . 95-96
Accredited Status . . . . . 3-4
Accrediting Commission for Schools . . . . . 69, 114
Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities . . . 69, 114
Administration . . . . . 33-35, 118
Admissions Policy . . . . . 20, 118
Affirmative Action . . . . . 18, 100
Appeal to Commission, see Review of Commission Actions
Appeal to WASC Board . . . . . 5, 66, 81, 88, 90-92
Appeals Procedures, WASC . . . . . 90-92
Appendix . . . . . 113-126
Audit, Independent Professional. . . . . 1, 32

Board (of Trustees), in Governance . . . . . 33-34
Board of WASC . . . . . 113
Budget . . . . . 31-33
Business Management . . . . . 32

Calendar . . . . . 118
California Community and Junior College Association (CCJCA) . . . . . 119
Candidacy, Candidate . . . . . 1-3
Candidacy, Reapplication . . . . . 4
Candidacy, Revocation of . . . . . 85
Candidacy Renewal Report, Format and Content . . . . . 41-42
Candidate Evaluation Team Visit . . . . . 2-4
Candidate Institutions, Procedures for . . . . . 3
Catalog . . . . . 12, 118
Change, Substantive . . . . . 43, 64, 82
Collective Bargaining . . . . . 35, 101, 122
Commission, Code of Good Practice and Ethical Conduct . . . . . 72-74
Commission Decisions on Institutions . . . . . 83
Commission Meetings, Public Access Policy . . . . . 71
Commission Members . . . . . 114
Commission Procedures for Accreditation Actions . . . . . 65-66
Commission Selection . . . . . 114
Community Services . . . . . 23-24
Complaints, Consideration of and Special Institutional Reviews . . . . . 81, 119
Comprehensive Evaluation Team Visit and Report . . . . . 56-60
Comprehensive Report, Documentation . . . . . 44-48
Comprehensive Report, Format and Content . . . . . 39-41
Confidential Recommendation Form . . . . . 124
Confidentiality and Disclosure of Information . . . . . 93

Conflict of Interest, Commission . . . . . 73-74
Contracts, Contractual Courses and Programs . . . . . 13-14
Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally
Accredited Organizations . . . . . 108-111
Coordination among WASC Commissions . . . . . 69
Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA) . . . . . 115-116
Credit . . . . . 12, 118, 119
Credit for Prior Experiential Learning . . . . . 98-99

Deferral of Candidacy or Accreditation . . . . . 84
Denial of Candidacy or Accreditation . . . . . 84
Disclosure and Confidentiality of Information . . . . . 93
District, see System
Documentation (for Self-Study) . . . . . 44-48

Educational Planning and Evaluation . . . . . 11
Educational Programs . . . . . 10-14
Eligibility, Review of and Report on . . . . . 2
Eligibility, see Accreditation, Conditions for Eligibility
Ethics and Integrity, Commission Procedures in Matters
of Institutional . . . . . 75
Evaluation Report . . . . . 57-64
Evaluation Team . . . . . 49-51, 54-64, 120
Evaluation Team Chairman . . . . . 52-53
Evaluation Visit . . . . . 49-50, 56-64
Executive Director . . . . . 119

Facilities, Physical . . . . . 29-30
Faculty . . . . . 16-18, 119
Faculty Council . . . . . 35
Faculty, in Governance . . . . . 35
Far West Council on Accreditation (FWCA) . . . . . 116
Fees . . . . . 126
Fifth-Year Report, Format and Content . . . . . 41-42
Fifth-Year Review Option, Special Project Report . . . . . 42
Fifth-Year Visit and Report . . . . . 61-62
Financial Resources . . . . . 31-32
Forms (Commission) . . . . . 123-126

General Education, Requirements in Specialized Programs . . . . . 94
Glossary of Definitions and Acronyms . . . . . 118-120
Goals and Objectives, Institutional . . . . . 8-9
Governance . . . . . 33-36

Integrity, Institutional . . . . . 79-80
Interim Report, Format and Content . . . . . 43
Interim Visit and Report . . . . . 5, 63

Learning Resources . . . . . 26-28
Liaison Officer . . . . . 78, 119
Library Resources, See Learning Resources

Mandatory Requirements of Institutions . . . . . 7
Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSACS) . . . . . 114
Military Base Programs . . . . . 102-107

Negative Actions . . . . . 84-85
New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) . . . . . 115
Non-Credit Programs . . . . . 14
Nondiscrimination . . . . . 100
Nontraditional Study . . . . . 95-96
North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS) . . . . . 115
Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges (NWASC) . . . . . 115

Observers (on Visiting Teams) . . . . . 50
Off-Campus Programs . . . . . 12-13

Periodic Review . . . . . 4
Physical Resources . . . . . 29-30
Policies, Commission . . . . . 67-112
President . . . . . 119
Probation . . . . . 84, 120
Procedures, Commission . . . . . 65-66
Program . . . . . 120
Public Access Policy . . . . . 71
Purposes of Institutional Accreditation . . . . . 68

Reapplication for Candidacy or Accreditation . . . . . 4
Refunds, Student Fees . . . . . 12
Regional Associations . . . . . 113-115
Regional Associations, Map . . . . . 117
Relationship Between General and Specialized Agencies . . . . . 70
Research, Continuing Institutional (Fifth-Year Option) . . . . . 4
Resources, Learning . . . . . 26-28
Resources, Physical . . . . . 29-30
Review and Appeal . . . . . 5, 65-66, 90-92, 118, 120
Review of Commission Actions . . . . . 86-89

Self-Study . . . . . 39-48
Self-Study, Suggestions for Organizing . . . . . 121
Self-Study Certification Form . . . . . 123
Self-Study Documentation . . . . . 44-48
Show Cause . . . . . 84-85, 120
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) . . . . . 115
Special Project Report, Format and Content . . . . . 42
Special Study Project (Fifth-Year Option) . . . . . 4
Specialized Programs, General Education Requirements . . . . . 94
Staff, Institutional . . . . . 16-18, 120
Standards . . . . . 6-38
Standards, Use of . . . . . 6-7
Student Evaluation . . . . . 12
Student Grievances and Refunds . . . . . 1-2, 21
Student Services . . . . . 20-21
Students, in Governance . . . . . 36
Substantive Change . . . . . 82
Substantive Change Visit and Report . . . . . 43, 64
Support Staff . . . . . 120
Support Staff, in Governance . . . . . 36
System and Institutional Accreditation . . . . . 76-77
System or District Relationships . . . . . 37-38

Termination of Accreditation . . . . . 5, 75, 83, 85
Transfers from Unaccredited Institutions . . . . . 97

Visiting Team, see Evaluation Team
Visits, see Candidate, Comprehensive, Fifth-Year, Interim and Substantive Change

Warning . . . . . 84
WASC Appeal, see Appeal to WASC Board and Appeals Procedures, WASC
Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) . . . . . 113

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
96 Powell Library Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

NOV 26 1982